DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 061 RC 007 443

AUTHOR Stoddard, Ellwyn R.
TITLE Mexican American Identity - A Multi-Cultural Legacy.
PUB DATE 22 Mar 73
NOTE 65p.; Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association annual meeting, Dallas, Texas, March 22, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Activism; *American History; American Indians; Anglo Americans; Civil Rights; *Cultural Differences; *Cultural Pluralism; Ethnology; *Mexican Americans; Mexicans; *Self Concept; Social Discrimination; Social Values; Spanish Americans

ABSTRACT

Investigating the background of Mexican American identify, the document determined that this identity is a dynamic image emerging from a continuous process of human development in which the genetic and cultural variations from European and indigenous peoples are combined within a complex historical situation. The combination includes: (1) the "1848 (Anglo)" image--a race of conquered people allowed to become U.S. citizens if and when they learn to become WASP middle class Americans; (2) "Spanish" ancestry--an image which identifies with lighter skinned Europeans; (3) "La Raza"--a glorification of the "mestizo" - the racial hybrid of Caucasian and indigenous peoples; (4) "Indian" ancestry--Mexican Americans who with to throw off the racist stigma of a dark skin and who overtly claim Indian ancestry; (5) "1848 (Mexican)" image--revised from the Anglo version, but accepting the Mexican War period as the beginning of their identity today; (6) "Chicano"--a militant, self-imposed label advocating self-determination and independence from Anglo evaluation; and (7) "Children of Aztlan"--an idealistic orientation within the overall Chicano movement which has attached its identity to pre-Aztec traditions. (KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 084061

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MEXICAN AMERICAN IDENTITY - A MULTI-CULTURAL LEGACY

by

Ellwyn R. Stoddard

Professor of Sociology

University of Texas at El Paso

Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association annual meeting - Dallas, Texas - March 22, 1973

RC007443

MEXICAN AMERICAN IDENTITY - A MULTI-CULTURAL LEGACY

Mexican Americans[1][2] are primarily located in the Southwestern United States. This minority might more correctly be classified as an "ethnic category" than as an ethnic group due to the diverse social classes, varied historical backgrounds and heterogeneous blends of genetic and cultural legacies represented among the collectivities included therein. Because they are usually referred by a single label, such as Mexican American, it is often assumed that they represent a homogeneous "folk-culture" in our midst.

> Existentially there is no Mexican-American community as such, nor is there such a "thing" as Mexican American culture. This group is fragmented socially, culturally, ideologically, and organizationally. It is characterized by extremely important social class, regional and rural-urban differences. (Peñalosa, 1967:405-406)

Yet, the popular literature and comtemporary history texts of the region abound with ethnic stereotypes, predominantly the three Ms--Machismo, María (Catholic dependency), and Mañana. Though the contemporary activist scene of the last decade has partially replaced this with the ABCs--Anti-Establishment, Barrio loyalty, Chicano power--these are no less erroneous.

Any scientific inquiry into "what or who constitutes a Mexican American" must explicitly delineate the theoretical approaches available, including the methodological problems of whether such identity is self-determined or bestowed by others outside the group. It must distinguish between social class differences, those of rural-urban residence, genetic legacies and historical setting within which images emerge. As this essay will show, ethnocentrism on the part of the individual attempting to define Mexican American identity will have a major impact on that particular epoch or era in which the identity genesis is based.

From among the many contemporary images of Mexican Americans, seven will be treated in some detail, carefully articulating the basic assumptions upon which they are based as well as the historical rationale used to perpetuate them. Also, these will be evaluated and compared with the latest scientific evidence available within each specific image framework. Briefly, these seven are the following:

1) "1848 (Anglo)" image - Mexican American image bestowed by Anglo majority; a race of conquered people, foreigners, allowed to live in the United States and become citizens if and when they learn to become WASP middle class Americans.

2) "SpanisH' Ancestry - An image which seeks to identify with lighter skinned European peoples and avoid the negative stigma attached to persons with darker skin color.

3) "La Raza" - A glorification of the mestizo - the racial hybrid of

Caucasian and Indigenous peoples; a mixture which brings forth a people superior to both "pure stocks" from which they are descendants.

4) "Indian" Ancestry - Mexican Americans who wish to throw off the racist stigma attached to dark skin color and, with impunity, challenge the white superiority dogma by overtly claiming an affinity with their darker skinned Indian ancestors and Indian culture.

5) "1848 (Mexican)" image - Mexican American image revised from the "1848 (Anglo)" version; but accepting the Mexican War period as the beginning of the Mexican American identity today.

6) Chicano - A self-imposed label advocating a greater degree of self-determination and increased independence from Anglo evaluations; a militant break with the past, accepting a label (Chicano) previously employed by Anglos in a derrogatory sense, to show their self-identity[15] no longer a product of Anglo bestowal.

7) Children of Aztlán - An idealistic orientation within the overall Chicano movement which has attached its present goals, identity, and destiny to the mystical past of pre-Aztec traditions.

The basic assumptions upon which each of them operate will now be examined in greater detail with documentation to show the strengths and weaknesses in the arguments as evaluated by the most accurate and precise scientific data currently available.

1) "1848 (Anglo)" Image

Of all current Mexican American stereotypes, this is the most widely distributed and believed. The Mexican American is characterized as a citizen of a foreign nation, Mexico, which in War was defeated by a superior nation made up of a superior people. Mexican Americans are viewed as a transplanted rural Mexican "folk culture", inextricably attached to superstitious and primitive beliefs which make them unable to develop as a fully civilized minority. Hence, assuming them to be a childlike people, they must be taken care of by superior Anglo leaders and patrons, leaving the ethnic group to occupy the status of second-class citizens. Those minority individuals who wish to be accepted as equals to Anglos must radically alter their cultural values, acculturating on the basis of the "Anglo conformity" model (Gordon, 1964). Some Spanish Americans who, with their ancestors, have continuously resided within the territorial boundaries of the Southwestern United States since more than a century prior to its cession to that nation, are confused with (often purposefully) third- or fourth-generation American citizens of Mexican descent, recent legal Mexican immigrants and illegal "wetbacks"[3]. This latter term becomes an extremely negative label (Bustamante, 1972) which is erroneously and unjustly applied to visible members of this minority group whose ancestors preceeded Anglo colonists to this region.

This country, as all countries, has rewritten its history from a perspective which enhances the American image (Commager, 1969). The idea of

early arrivals coming to the United States for religious freedom becomes more accurate when seen as an aversion to religious dictation from others (while rigidly enforcing their religious practices on all future colonists wishing to reside in their community). A closer look at the American slogan of Deity ordaining this country to reach from ocean to ocean ("manifest destiny") shows it to be essentially the same rationalization used by the German Kaiser and Hitler for expansion into neighboring lands--a thinly veiled doctrine of imperialism and exploitation of indigenous peoples. So it is not surprising to find that ethnic and nationality groups who do not fit these nationalistic models are downgraded and caricaturized by ridicule, ignominity, and inferiority (Robinson, 1963; Simmen, 1971). Studies of grammar and secondary school texts reveal the prevelance of Mexican Americans depicted as "outlaws" or inferior, stupid people (Marcus, 1961; Slotkin, 1964; Jones, 1970; Gaines, 1972). But even more of an affront than to have ones ethnic group distorted as an unsavory type is to discover them and their cultural contributions being conspicuously absent from novels and stories read in the schools (Blatt, 1968). And further, the negative consequences of this literary license is that the children who read these materials and conceive of them as an accurate description of history are totally unaware of these exclusions (Kranyik, 1965). A type of cultural amnesia is self evident when one sees Mexican American contributions to architecture, art, music, and artifacts prominently displayed throughout the region which are obviously the products of an ahistorical people. Perhaps the most ironic of all is that the singular symbol of power in the United States, the dollar sign, is a corruption of the abbreviation for the peso! (Menninger, 1970: figure 190). Lest social science criticize the popular culture for its unfair exclusionism of Mexican American cultural contributions, they have done little better within their professional journals and sophisticated scientific writings in accurately describing Mexican Americans (Glenn, 1971:4; Heller, 1966:7).

The American Heritage is equated with the verbal ideal of equality for citizens from all nations. America has been proud of her self-described amalgamation of many nations into a "melting pot" of all races, creeds, and nationalities. Although the fallacy of this concept has been known for many decades, recently documented evidence exposes its duplicity.

American practice, as opposed to the "melting pot" verbal ideal, has been that of segregation between ethnic, religious and racial groups, such as Blacks (Dollard, 1937; Myrdal, 1944; Drake and Cayton, 1945), Jews (Handlin and Handlin, 1959; Rights, 1968), Indians (Brown, 1971; Wax, 1971) Italians (Lopreato, 1970), Japanese (Peterson, 1971) and Mexicans (Stoddard, 1973). Even in the minority conglomerate of New York City, Glaser and Moynihan conclude that "the fact about the melting pot... is that it did not happen." (1963:v). The once popular historical concept, the Turner Thesis" advocating the role of the American frontier as a catalyst for the "melting pot", has likewise been rejected by contemporary scholars. It read:

> In the crucible of the frontier the immigrants were Americanized, liberalized, and fused into a mixed race, English in neither nationality nor characteristics. The process has gone on from the early days

to our own (Turner, 1920:11).

In place of this romanticized notion, the actual social structure in the Southwest resembles a "campfire pot"--white lid on top, burned darker in color as one approaches the bottom.

Another romantic notion of America is that it is a land of opportunity for the poor and unfortunate of the world. This is symbolized by the verse on the plaque attached to the Statue of Liberty which reads in part:

> Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free
> The wretched refuse of your teeming shore
> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door!

Yet, huddled masses from the teeming shore of the Rio Grande looked in vain for the light beside the golden door during the decades of the 20th Century when they were arbitrarily rejected from entry (even though no enforced Mexican quotas were in effect) because of poverty and lack of education. The only exceptions were when large numbers of Mexicans were allowed into the United States to temporarily ease the short supply of agricultural laborers. One of the largest waves of Mexican immigrants came following America's "Gentlemen's Agreement" in 1909, stemming the "Yellow Peril" of Asian immigrants. Those who did arrive in the United States were faced subsequently with discriminatory employment and unbearable wage practices where their services were no longer required or when Anglos felt inclined to show their superiority to the dark-skinned Mexican race through ridicule and deceit (Taylor, 1931:238; McWilliams, 1939; 195ff; Shapiro, 1952; Gonzalez, 1969: 92-93; Romano-V., 1968:14-15; Lara-Braund, 1970; Moore, 1970a:23-24). This discriminatory condition has persisted into this present decade. Today Mexican Americans are still overly represented in the laborer categories and in the Culture of Poverty levels (Dotson, 1955:162; Miller, 1964:69; Fogel, 1965:20; Olivarez, 1970:8-10). Mexican Americans alone, of the two dozen major ethnic immigrant peoples, show no higher socio-economic standing for the families here three generations than for the first generation immigrant family (Bogue, 1959:372; Browning and McLemore, 1964:65; Peñalosa, 1969). Since the education gap between Anglo American and Mexican American youth is growing smaller, it is hoped that this socio-economic picture will change in the near future. There is one small ray of hope in this otherwise dismal picture and that is a recent demographic study showing that some of the lack of upward mobility in second-and third-generation Mexican American families is accounted for when Mexican Americans leave better paying "dirty work" jobs for "clean work", lower paying, but higher prestige positions (Renner, 1969). It may well be that following this generational crossover there will be some sign of opportunity for Mexican Americans in America. It certainly appears that from the perspective of the bulk of Mexican Americans in the Southwest today that the Statue of Liberty plaque has lost something in its translation into Spanish!

Throughout the United States prior to World War I there were large immigrant minority groups from Europe--called hyphenated-Americans[4] including German-Americans, Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans and Polish-

Americans who became confused with America's European enemies. Politically motivated patriots, among them Theodore Roosevelt, called upon them to rid themselves of their hyphenated state and to become "100% Americans." (Higham, 1970:Chapters 6-9). This consisted of speaking English only, of repudiating the language of their forefathers, their dress and customs, and adopt Anglo American ways. A few Mexican Americans living in the United States followed the "Anglo Conformity" model of success. Many ethnic patriotic associations flourished among Mexican Americans in the Southwest during the 1920s culminating in the federation of many smaller ones in the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). Some of those Mexican Americans who accommodated to Anglo culture became proprietors, political representatives of Post World War II, educated technicians, educators and other professionals. Their children of the World War II era would eventually reject this facile acceptance of the "1848 (Anglo)" image model, and substitute for it their own ethnic-oriented ideals.

The extreme ethnocentrism showed by Americans toward non-English languages demonstrates a near-pathological fear of tongues they cannot understand and refuse to learn, somewhat characteristic of culturally limited monoglots (one language speakers). Whereas in Europe a student might converse with his parents in Swiss, respond in school speaking French, and conduct part of his business in German. In contrast, in the United States the facility with another language (not English) has been accepted as an a priori criterion of national or cultural disloyalty (except among our intellectual elite, where Ph.D. candidates are required to have minimal facility in two foreign languages to demonstrate their broader cultural base.) To demonstrate the extreme to which English-speaking Americans have gone to downgrade non-English languages, here is an excerpt from Harold Howe II, the former U. S. Commissioner of Education.

> [Our society] equates Anglo American origin and Anglo American ways with virtue, with goodness, even with political purity. Other cultures are not only different; they are inferior. They must be wiped out, not only for the good of the country, but for the good of the child. Not only must he learn to speak English; he must stop speaking anything else. (Montez, 1970:30. Italics emphasis added.)

Though this extreme dogma of language exclusivism has waned in recent years, the negative consequences of its implementation throughout earlier decades will still be felt among Mexican Americans of the next two or three generations.

Following logically from the "1848 (Anglo)" stereotype of the inadequacy of Spanish in formal education training is the inquiry into the low level of education attained by members of this minority group. "Why don't they do well and why do they drop out of the education process so early?" A more precise analysis of this differential rate of formal education attainment by Mexican Americans can be undertaken from at least three different perspectives; from the viewpoint of traditionally-oriented school functionaries inquiring into the student's culture and developed skills, from the view of one assessing the role of education as now operating in the lives of pupils, and studies of intervening variables which correlate with non-achievement among Mexican American students.

The "1848 (Anglo)" stereotype shifts the responsibility for a lower level of school attainment to the minority pupil himself and his cultural values. Proponents of this approach point out that Mexican American students tenaciously hold on to their Spanish language (even using it in informal conversation on the school grounds, which has been a punishable offense until just two or three years ago), they seem to be unwilling or unable to handle their own problems and their educational experience within the codes of middle class conduct, and their reference group is the ethnic barrio rather than the Anglo teacher models. Some well meaning romantic "apologists" absolve the ethnic pupils from responsibility for their poor school record by sympathetically applying to them the deadly label, cultural disadvantaged (Brussel, 1968). To this entire argument it must be said that the predominantly lower class norms of barrio life, experienced and expressed through the Spanish language, is the dominant social class orientation (not entirely a cultural component) and is the realistic world from which the Mexican American student comes. Instead of visualizing his situation as cultural disadvantaged, however, it has been wisely argued that when these students are perceived as culturally different, their unique customs, holidays, music and language can be used by a skilled bi-cultural teacher to enrich and broaden the outlook of all class members, without the devastating stigma of inferiority being applied to those from culturally different environments (Brooks, 1968).

A second orientation toward assessing responsibility for poor achievement records of Mexican American school children is focused on the school system itself; the training of its teachers, the communication media, the subject matter and curricula. Studies of ethnic student attitudes indicate that they find the subject matter unrelated to their world, the curricula irrelevant for understanding and solving the real problems they face outside the classroom, and the implicit assumption of Spanish inferiority (or outright "undesirable") humiliating to ethnic students in the classroom who are ascribed second-class status on non-intellectual grounds. (Cordova, 1969). The rigid, narrow training of most teachers does not include an awareness on their part of their own middle class WASP biases, nor are they prepared to understand their minority students as a product of a lower class environment. When Anglo students are unruly it is interpreted as a normal reaction while "trying to find themselves" whereas the same behavior on the part of Mexican Americans (a clear departure from behavior expectations based on the "1848 (Anglo)" stereotype) is considered outright deviancy, a sign of ethnic rebellion and personal hostility. Moreover, school counselors and related functionaries are prone to advise ethnic students to enter vocational or technical training upon completion of high school, because their cultural background is unsuitable for further academic training (Cf. Stoddard, 1973:Chapter 5 for more extensive discussion of these points).

Social scientists and educators have conducted studies with minority students, correlating the non-intellectual factors relating to non-school achievement. Such intervening variables as family size, socio-economic level, parental education, parental authority, students perceptions of education etc. are then described as salient factors in explaining school attrition among Mexican Americans (Gill and Spilka, 1962; García and Yoshino, 1969; Uhlenberg, 1972 to illustrate the variety of approaches). In the

closely related area of student motivation, recent empirical studies have seriously questioned the traditional assumption that Mexican American students suffer from low aspiration and insufficient personal motivation. Kuvlesky et al. (1971) in an extensive comparison of Chicano, Black and Anglo youth populations in the Texas lower valley found that aspiration levels within each ethnic/racial group ran the gamut from extremely high to extremely low. Mexican Americans, though having higher aspirations than their Anglo American cohorts, suffered goal deflection or a realistic appraisal that the outside world was so structured as to deny them an equal chance to attain their aspired goals. In former studies such attitudes are interpreted to mean a lack of motivation. In this framework, it is seen as a very clear view of reality guaged by the opportunities afforded their fathers and grandfathers within this geographical region where the mental set of "conquest psychology" has been predominant (Moore, 1970b). Borup and Elliott (1969) found that Mexican American college students had values which corresponded to the "Anglo American value orientation" checklist more closely than those of their Anglo American cohorts. Stoddard (1969:487) found that Mexican American youth in an isolated barrio chose "hard work" as their salient core value over the value of "obedience" expressed by their parents. This demonstrated an intergenerational differential probably reflecting educational training rather than being explained by the inadequacy of Mexican American culture. The "1848 (Anglo)" image is a deadly stereotype which begins by condemning the Mexican American student, forcing him to extricate himself from "guilt" by openly repudiating his language and culture in a hostile environment.

A traditional dogma claiming the Mexican American race as intellectually inferior (as measured by English I.Q. tests) was "validated" by Garth (1923), Garretson (1928) and others. Even though we now understand that I.Q. tests reflect the learning of middle class social skills rather than inherent intellectual potential (Anastasi, 1950; Garcia, 1972) the carryover from decades past makes I.Q. scores a "lethal label" (Mercer, 1972) for segregating these ethnic students in a "Mexican room" and conferring upon them an EMR (Educable Mentally Retarded) status. Though civil rights action as late as 1946 and 1948 coerced California and Texas into abolishing Mexican American segregation, recent legal action was required to halt anew the insidious and capricious practice of equating Spanish-speaking and EMR syndromes (CRD, 1971:12-13. It is little wonder that minority students become disgusted and attempt to dissociate themselves as soon as possible from an educational setting in which their culture and language is constantly on trial for being "inferior" within the established "1848 (Anglo)" stereotype.

In trying to define the parameters of Mexican American culture, it is rather confusing inasmuch as it can be considered a variation from Mexican culture or from Anglo society. As Peñalosa correctly explains:

> If we accept the concept of Mexican-American culture...as a variant of the United States working class subculture, but influenced to a lesser or stronger degree by traditional Mexican folk culture, it follows that these people should be regarded as partially Mexicanized-Americans rather than as partially Americanized-Mexicans (1967:410)

Acculturation studies which assumed Mexican American culture to be a set

values lying midpoint between those of Mexico and of the United States have discovered that Mexican American values were oftimes at polar extremes to both Mexican and American values; a somewhat unique value system rather than merely a variation from or a synthesis of these two (Nall, 1962:37; Peck and Díaz Guerrero, 1967).

Perhaps the most pernicious beliefs surrounding Mexican American culture have emerged from the use of the "value orientation" model. Positing a homogeneity within Anglo American and Mexican American societies, dominant value themes were assigned as characteristic of each society, with the implication that non-Anglo variants were "un-American". Popularized by Florence Kluckhohn from her Radcliffe College dissertation in 1937 until well into the 1950s, this model was adopted as a legitimate point of departure for many subsequent "scientific investigators" (Saunders, 1954; Mead, 1955; Edmonson, 1957; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Madsen, 1964; Rubel, 1966 and Heller, 1966). Not only did the basic framework erroneously assume a homogeneity of values within each culture (apparently unaffected by different geographical regions, socio-economic levels, rural-urban residence, and age and sex differences) but the implicit bias of middle class values permeating the Anglo America orientation caused existing social class differences to be interpreted as ethnic differences (Casavantes, 1969). An exhaustive list of the various "cultural values" included under each ethnic heading was compiled by Vaca (1970b:45) as follows:

MEXICAN AMERICAN ORIENTATION	ANGLO AMERICAN ORIENTATION
Subjugation to nature	Mastery over nature
Present oriented	Future oriented
Immediate gratification	Deferred gratification
Complacent	Aggressive
Non-intellectual	Intellectual
Fatalistic	Non-fatalistic
Non-goal oriented	Goal oriented
Non-success oriented	Success oriented
Emotional	Rational
Dependent	Individualistic
Machismo	Effeminacy[7]
Superstitious	Non-superstitious
Traditional	Progressive

A majority of social scientists reject the "value orientation" approach as a valid means or studying contemporary Mexican Americans. Replicated studies of earlier works show immense disparity in the final conclusions made. For instance, Swadesh (1972) reported that when goal directed, future time orientation and progressive values are interpreted within the local village milieu of northern New Mexico (rather than as seen from urban middle class WASP perspectives), these residents followed the value system designated as an Anglo American orientation. Chandler and Ewing (1971) compared Anglo American rural and urban residents with Mexican Americans and reported no significant difference between them.

The methodological and conceptual biases inherent within this approach are as dysfunctional as are the distortions in value interpretations. The "value orientation" model was developed from methodological

tools used by ethnographers describing isolated "folk cultures", which U.S. Mexican Americans are implicitly assumed to be. A folk culture is a very small, self-contained system with few external contacts which, therefore, has been able to develop a high degree of value-homogeneity. This is compared to a peasant society in which large masses of subordinated peoples exist in daily interaction with the social and economic institutions dominated by elites. (Foster, 1953:170). From early ethnographic accounts of the relatively rare folk culture enclaves in rural Mexico (Redfield 1930:141; Lewis, 1951) the mistaken notion became popular that such studies reflected the vast majority of rural Mexico peoples, a misconception easily refuted by examining the immense variation in core values of Mexican immigrants (Arciniega, 1971) or by reading the scholarly works emphasizing the extreme cultural variations found within the Republic of Mexico regions and peoples (Cline, 1963; Simpson, 1964; Hayner, 1966). Leeds, an anthropologist himself, criticizes the use of the "holistic" observation method in modern, complex societies when it has been shown to contain many biases even when used on small, isolated folk cultures (1968). The work of many investigators (Zeleny, 1944; Simmons, 1952; Sanders, 1954; Mead, 1955) reflects this bias of assuming Mexican American culture to be simply a "folk culture transplant" from rural Mexico.

Factual errors are even more apparent today when comparing Mexican Americans in the United States with the traditional "folk culture" model. Less than twenty percent of Mexican Americans in the Southwest are rural residents, let alone being completely self-contained encapsulated "folk cultures." More than 80 percent live in two states, California and Texas, with less than six percent of the Mexican American population of these two states being classified as rural in 1960 (Barrett, 1966:163). Even more astounding is that one of every three Mexican Americans in the United States reside within the following four SMSAs: Los Angeles, San Antonio, San Francisco and El Paso. And yet, the continuing impact of the rural stereotype continues to be the focus of romantics who wish to maintain the images of the past, whether or not they be accurate. It is quite evident from the above discussion that Mexican Americans can be little understood by applying to them models and generalizations developed from studies of isolated, rural Mexico (Broom and Shevky, 1952:152; Clark, 1959:96-97; Penalosa, 1967:408). Especially is this applicable to Spanish Americans of northern New Mexico who were never Mexicans but arrived in their present location some two centuries prior to the existence of the Mexican Republic.

A summary of the "1848 (Anglo)" image shows it to be an and distorted view of Mexican Americans--both historically and presently. Not only are there glaring factual errors contained within it, but the overall permeation of ethnocentric stereotypes makes it scientifically invalid as an objective view of reality, whether of Mexican American culture or of Anglo American culture itself.

2) "Spanish Ancestry

The claim to being "Spanish, not Mexican" is a direct reaction to assumed inferiority of persons with darker skin color. To fully understand the "Spanish" identity, it is necessary to survey the racist doc-

trines prevelent in Europe which were transferred by the Spanish to the New World and there promulgated through social, political, religious and economic institutions.

Segmented societies are nothing new, having existed for at least 2,000 years of recorded history (Hoetink, 1967). Spain had been associated with the darker skinned Moors for about seven centuries prior to the advent of Columbus, 400 years of which were spent as a subject people to them. The mixture of racist philosophies of Nordic superiority popular in Europe in that period with hatred for the "darker skinned heathen" were elements in the racist dogmas and practices on the Iberian peninsula at that time. African Negro slaves had been bought and sold in Spain for some time prior to the discovery of the New World (Rogler, 1946) and written accounts of Spanish women painting their faces white and red to hide their swarthy appearance, considered a sign of ugliness, shows the extent to which racism was practiced by Iberian peoples (Freyre, 1946:13). Even Spanish regulations controlling the colonists approved to migrate to the New World required a three-generation genealogy free of Moorish blood (even though there is ample evidence that such determination, certified by the Church, rewarded religious loyalty as if it were racial purity) (Mörner, 1967:13, 16, 55, 58). This highly developed stratification system (based upon the superiority of white skin color) was transferred to America and established as the "Society of Castes"--truly a "pigmentocracy." (Mörner, 1967). Even a very critical distinction between the "pure whites" born in Spain (Peninsulars) and their direct offspring born in America (Creoles) proclaimed the latter generations infinitely inferior to the Iberian-born elite.

During much of the first century of conquest and occupation, racial mixture occured from expbitive, illicit sexual liaisons. The racially-mixed offspring, mestizos, were identified as synonymous with the term for illegitimacy. But as Church pressures for the legalization of all conjugal unions, including the racially mixed liaisons, the strict "Caste" levels became more and more adulterated through legal inheritance; and the legal distinctions between the racial categories were at variance with the social distinctions, the latter based heavily upon a person's physical appearance.[10] Therefore, among the well-to-do ranks caste/color discrepancies called for official notations such as the following:

> Manuel Hilario Lopez, Spaniard as he says but of very suspect color...
> Juan Antonio Mendoz, Castizo of obscure skin (Aguirre Beltran,1946:273-274)

With subsequent generations, wealth had an effect of "lightening" the skin color (Mörner, 1967:136, 147). Moreover, a well elaborated schedule of financial payments (a Cédula de Gracias a Sacar) were set up by the Church to remove ones Negro or Indian "color" for a price (Gibson, 1966:129-130). In individual cases, qualified service to the Crown (especially successful military conquest or wealth-producing activity) entitled one to social graces beyond his color caste level (Mörner, 1967:84-86). Clearly, an emphasis on one's Spanish ancestry and a corresponding repudiation of ones native lineage was a prerequisite for the maintenance of a social elite status.

Racial discrimination and segregation in Mexico was not discontinued

with the event of the Mexican War of Independence. Even toward the latter part of the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries, the Creoles (and those of lower castes assimilated into their group) were still entrenched (Aguirre Beltrán, 1946:273-274) although the earlier distinctions on caste were largely class differences (Beals, 1955). The popular practice for Mexican elite was to emphasize their Spanish heredity and avoid Indian identity (Forbes, 1968:56). This association of lighter skin with superior social position was further reinforced by Mexican American immigrants encountering Anglo institutions during the early decades of the Twentieth Century (Gamio, 1930:50-52). So desperate were some to belong to a superior "white" culture that they ascribed a "whiteness" to their Aztec forbears (Forbes, 1968).

Up to three decades ago, it was popular among Mexican Americans (especially those trying for Anglo acceptance and increased social mobility) to trace their genealogical lines through their Hispano ancestry only (Burma, 1954:96). Even research of that era reflects the popular use of euphemistic names such as Hispanos (Winnie, 1960: 363-364), Latinos (Madsen, 1964) and "Spanish" (Heller, 1966:7). Even government cautiously entered the field by attempting to find a non-controversial term for Census use, ending up with Spanish-speaking and Spanish surname designations.

Among the residents of northern New Mexico, the name Spanish American is not only a term denoting "genetic purity" but also a claim of pure lineal descent from early Spanish nobility. All late arrivals (such as immigrants to the United States since the latter part of the Nineteenth Century) are referred to as Mexican Americans.

Historically, the Society of Castes operative in New Granada was carried to northern New Mexico by Don Juan de Oñate and his company in 1598. Pureblood Pueblo Indians were assigned to the lowest castes, racially mixed offspring occupying the intermediate levels, and "pure" and hybrid descendent families of the early dominant elite persisted in their ascribed level of social superiority long after the Society of Castes deteriorated in New Granada (Leonard, 1943:118ff).

The exclusive reservation of "Spanish American" designation did not become general practice until after the turn of the Twentieth Century when the large number of recent Mexican immigrants fleeing from the Revolution of 1910 arrived in the Santa Fe area. The increasingly powerful Anglo traders and administrators confused those of the old traditional families with the new immigrants, thus necessitating the preemption of the "Spanish American" term as their exclusive property (Gonzalez, 1969: Chapter 8). As a further reinforcement of racial and social differences among these various levels of Spanish surname peoples, the Spanish American elite refused to associate with or to openly assist the newly arrived Mexican immigrants (Servín, 1965:148). Even to the present day adults reared in the traditions of the Manitos prefer the designation of "Spanish American" rather than "Mexican American" or "Chicano" (Moore, 1970:8) although among the militant youth the term "Chicano" expresses both their liberation from Anglo domination and from their tradition-oriented elders.

According to most researchers among the peoples of northern New

Mexico, the claim to "pure Spanish lineage" is more symbolic or legendary than real (Johansen, 1941:15; Zeleny, 1944;355; Walter, 1952; Edmonson, 1957:16). One recent publication stated that even as early as 1800 "only a few hundred of the 20,000 persons claiming to be 'Spanish' were wholly that in ancestry." (Meinig, 1971:14). Yet, because of the persistent belief, even Indian intermarriage today is carefully avoided (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961: 205). Even the verbal pronouncements of the "New Breed" by Reies Tijerina created a dissaffection among his loyal Spanish American followers when he openly advocated the return of the Sacred Blue Lake of the Taos Pueblos back to their exclusive use (Swadesh, 1968:167), and similar backlash from open liaisons with Black Power and Indian militants (Gardner, 1970:222-232).

In the wake of the Civil Rights Movement, a more liberal attitude toward skin color had emerged in the Southwest as elsewhere in the country. Sometimes this has become an overacceptance by the militant and the younger generation, a desire to identify with piel de color (dark skin) to emphasize their dissatisfaction with the prejudice based upon skin color directed against their fathers. The societal backlash against "reverse racism" in the early 1970s still retains a residue of increased tolerance, making less necessary the practice of "social Chloroxing" (ie. claiming to be "Spanish".) Peñalosa and McDonagh (1966:504) observed in Southern California a growing trend away from claiming to be "Spanish", and increased pride in the "Mexican" label during the mid-1960s. But even this has not produced a uniform agreement on self-identity or the "correct labels" to be employed. Some terms acceptable when used by in-group cohorts are resented when employed by members of the larger society (cf. Stoddard, 1970a). In addition, generation-age differences have influenced the preferred self-designated names as have regional patterns of usage and continuously changing connotation of various words. This was revealed in 1958 during the critical politicization process when the Mexican American Political Association (MAPA) was organized in California. An attempt was made to unify all members of this ethnic group throughout the Southwest into a single, powerful political force. Yet, a Texas organization, Political Association of Spanish-speaking Organizations (PASSO or PASO) rejected the "Mexican American" nomenclature of MAPA while the California-based association rejected the compromising "Spanish-speaking" label (Cuellar, 1970:148)

Ever since the emergence and popularity of the Chicano Movement(s), to use the "Spanish" designation is personally avoided since it represents the practice of identifying with the "Caucasian superiority" dogma. Persons born in the peninsula of Spain are hard pressed to tell Mexican Americans that they are indeed "Spanish" without also conveying a false feeling of shame for their true ancestry. It appears that the days of unquestioned acceptance of Caucasian (including "Spanish") superiority are terminated and the prestige accrued by using the "Spanish" identity label is no longer honored within the ethnic group. The generation who proudly bore the Spanish American identity label in northern New Mexico will retain it. Their younger generations consider it outmoded, a "racist" term, an unsavory reminder of Anglo ridicule because of their mixed genetical and cultural heritage. Hence, they will no longer embrace and perpetuate it as did their forefathers just to soothe the feelings of the dominant Anglo society.

3) La Raza

The setting within which the concept of La Raza emerged encompasses more than 400 years of Mexican history. At the time of Cortés' conquest, more than five million tribute-paying persons were being ruthlessly controlled by a mere 60,000 Mexico's located in Tenochtitlán. The barbaric religious rituals of human sacrifice, adopted from the earlier religious cult of Kulkulkan[11], had been a very effective measure to liquidate unruly political dissenters. Thus, Cortés easily found native allies and guides who, themselves, wished to be rid of the Aztec despots; some having only been conquered a mere two decades previously (Gibson, 1966:26-27). Following the death of Moctezuma II and the two short years of brave resistance under his son-in-law nephew, Cuauhtémoc, the Spanish victory became a slaughter carried out both by the Spanish soldiers as well as their Indian allies.

> The Spaniards leveled the pyramids and temples, ending the native priésthoods, burned their books, and obliterated as much of the Indians civilization as possible (Josephy, 1968:215).

All Indian elite strata (including early allies) were purposefully and meticulously annihilated making the Aztec power structure, based as it was upon a strict heirarchical ranking of power and social differentials, unable to function any longer (Cumberland, 1968: 53-54). The power shift from Aztec to Spanish domination resulted in a radical change of racial policies which found the former masters now the recipients of imperialistic policy instituted and governed by others. In a very short time the former Indian allies were subjected to identical treatment by the Spanish nobility.

The loss of power and governmental control was not the only major shift within the New World. There was a radical reoverhaul of the population in terms of numbers, composition, and regional density. From 1520 throughout the following century and a quarter, more Indians died every sixty days than the total number of Iberian colonists who arrived in the New World during that entire 125 year period (Cumberland, 1968: 45-51). Following a period of two centuries, the factors of military conquest, lack of resistance to European diseases, and misceginatíon all contributed to the lowering of the Indian population from an estimated 25 million to only a few million. By the beginning of the 19th century, the New Granada population consisted of approximately 1,300,000 Spanish (of which only 70,000 were the ultra-elite Peninsular-born whites), 1,400,000 mestizos of various types, a small number of Negroes (10,000) and a stabilized Indian fullblood population of 3,100,000 (Othón de Mendizabal, 1968; Borah, 1951:181). It should be pointed out that these population figures are desceptive as indices of power or decision-making control. The mere handful of 70,000 peninsulars held all key policy-making positions and the remaining Indians had either been relocated close to the mining operations in Central Mexico or were still in relative isolation and not integrated into the administrative heirarchy (except through the local clergy working with indigenous peoples.) The disenfranchized, American-born Creoles, "white" but second-class citizens in relationship to the exclusive Peninsulars, began to encourage the rapidly increasing number of mixed-bloods to overthrow their Peninsular

lords (although when the revolts began, both Creoles and Peninsulars were classified as gabachos and attempts to liquidate the Peninsulars were indiscriminately directed against them both.) The Popular Revolt of 1810 and Mexican Independence a decade later came about with a large number of mestizos having been assimilated into the Creole castes. During this half-century, mestizo-power supplied the majority of the liberating military forces which created the dozen or more new independent nations in Latin America. This was an open sign that European domination of the Western Hemisphere was broken. In Mexico, loyalties to the Spanish crown were rapidly ebbing, and voluntary contacts with other European powers, notably France, created an even weaker cultural influence from the Spanish monolithic institutional structures.

At the beginning of the Twentieth Century, Spain made new overt efforts to recapture New World loyalties on an equalitarian nation-to-nation basis. One of these concessions was the glorification of the date commemorating the discovery of America. In 1917, the date of October 12th was set aside for celebrating Columbus Day, and La Fiesta de la Raza was officially inaugurated. Through succeeding years this holiday came to be known throughout Latin America as El Día de la Raza. It had become a separate and distinct celebration from that commemorating the story of European domination represented by Columbus and the Spanish Crown.[11] In this historical milieu, La Raza developed as a term emphasizing the mestizo peoples of both Americas. This racial mixture claimed to be superior to the original contributors by synthesizing the technological abilities of the Caucasian and the "cosmic endurance of the Indian". The label La Raza becoming a short symbol for a "happy combination of quasi-scientific ideas about race and humanistic interpretations" of the mestizo (Rivera, 1972:2-3, 5). Vasconcelos' book, La Raza Cósmica (The Cosmic Race) highlighted this popular idea of the 1920s. He viewed the mestizo as a fifth race imbued with the magical "Quinto Sol" of Aztec mythology, "an ethnic and spiritual fusion of all peoples" (1926:16) focusing their future destiny far beyond the materialistic, scientific world of reason. Vasconcelos stressed the area of esthetic fulfillment, represented by an emergent stage of spiritual power, as the future destiny of La Raza. As subsequently interpreted by the Mexican American Lara-Braud, La Raza symbolizes an ideology rather than a genetic and cultural mixture. La Raza means,

> not the hope of ethnic hegemony, but the hope of triumph by all humanity over all that dehumanizes, over all forms of tyranny... a symbol of the New World's promise of universal freedom, human dignity and human solidarity (Lara-Braud, 1970:11).

Perhaps the time was not ripe for a more complete acceptance of mestizo superiority, or possibly because of more practical problems brought on by the Depression years, Vasconcelos' ideology of genetic and esthetic superiority of the mestizo as a distinct, identifiable race declined in popularity even while the concept of La Raza as an indeterminable symbol of national pride remained.

Subsequent popular Mexican writers and poets have not followed in the Vasconcelos tradition. Instead of the intense pride in the Spanish-Indian genetic pool, these seem to focus on the central underlying theme

with philosphical justifications for exploitive activities. When Spaniards found mineral wealth, Indian claims to the metal or land were immediately and forcibly dealt with. When labor was required for extraction, Indian populations were considered expendible. Such was the realities of Indian policy as far as Royal Spain was concerned.

In the realm of official written policy pertaining to the ethical issue of Indian treatment, the earliest decree of the Crown was "the Requierimiento", a proclamation to be read aloud (usually in Spanish) prior to any major military engagement or upon the occasion of formally taking possession of "newly discovered" lands. This proclamation contained a religious history of Christianity with a chronology of man's creation to the present Church, Papal, and Monarchical powers. It demanded complete obedience to them by these indigenous inhabitants of the New World, and those who refused this divine invitation to acquiesce faced "coercive subjugation, alienation of property, and punishment appropriate to traitors." (Gibson, 1966:39). Thus, it placed blame on the Indian incorrigibility for causing the extensive military campaigns and forceable subjugation of these heathen peoples.

The earliest mining operations in Hispañola had resulted in a complete extermination of the limited Indian population on that island.[13] In Central Mexico, as local Indian tribes were "used up" whole Indian communities were moved into the region to serve as a new labor supply. The early institutions of encomienda and repartimiento[14] though officially outlawed in the reforms of 1609 were continued under the practices of debt peonage.[15]

From the early days of conquest, the full-blooded Indian's caste had been at the bottom of the Society of Castes just above the Negro slave level. The illegitimate offspring of Spanish males with Indian females were neither Spanish nor Indian, thus they were socially downgraded to the level of the mother because of their illegitimate status. When the Church forced existing conjugal unions to be solemnized by marriage upon threat of expulsion from the Church, mestizo offspring began to permeate the upper levels of the Society of Castes heirarchy. Not only were mixed-bloods able to gain access to prestige and power positions with greater facility than full-blood Indians, but the near extermination of the full-bloods (from 25 million to merely 1 or 2 million) radically decreased their numerical bid for power. They were exploited by white Spanish overlords and by all levels of mestizos as well. Claiming a full-blood Indian ancestry did little to provide a positive image or human dignity for anyone within Spanish colonial society.

In northern New Mexico a pattern of Indian exploitation similar to that had occurred. The resident Pueblo Indians had been reduced to five-sixths of their original number within the first century of Spanish colonization (Meinig, 1971:14-15). Jesuit missions in Arizona and Franciscan fathers in California had already organized frontier religions communities using the indigenous peoples and their lands as the raw materials (Wax, 1971:11; Moquin, 1971d:153). Inasmuch as no other concentrations of sedentary indigenous cultures existed elsewhere along the borderlands, the border area did not merit further consideration as a priority region for colonial expansion and Indian exploitation (Gibson, 1966:190-194).

In Mexico, prior to the Popular Revolt of 1810, Mestizos had shared some Church and administrative roles with the white elite whereas Indian full-bloods had not participated except in servile roles. Following Mexican Independence in 1821, government efforts were concentrated on producing national solidarity and reducing the variations in language and culture, mestizage differentiation, and political isolation. Not very successful when inaugurated as a voluntary program, it was followed by ruthless military compliance using the tactics of destruction and massacre where needed. Such a campaign was launched among the Yaqui in Sonora and by 1868 an uneasy "brief peace" had been forceably instituted. (Wax, 1971: 11-13). Even under President Benito Juárez,[17] the full-blooded Zapotec Indian, uncooperative Indians who would not become "Mexicanized" (including the Spanish language substituted for their indigenous one) were considered an obstacle to the goal of bringing full-blooded Indians into Mexican society as equals. Though less aggressive in pursuing acculturation goals, the paternalistic Díaz regime continued as its official policy, a well rationalized benign neglect of Indian peoples. They declared:

> The mass of the population...could not and would not work efficiently; they were dirty and vicious and lazy; they had to be taught obedience; they would not save money because they were drunkards, and whatever wage they received was probably more than their productivity deserved. The only salvation for Mexico lay in attracting Catholic European immigrants whose industry and intelligence would transform the land (Cumberland, 1968:191).

The indigenous movement had clearly not yet been born.

At the turn of the Century, the Republic under the Díaz regime girded for a major economic and political upheaval. By 1905 financial chaos had accompanied Mexico's shift from the silver to the gold monetary standard. The discontent preceeding the Revolution of 1910 resulted in direct consequences of widespread destruction and indirect consequences of decreased agricultural production and mineral extraction. Though by this time the earlier rigid castes had largely disappeared, these had been supplanted by slightly more permeable class strata but with the same indigenous peoples in the bottom layers of the social and economic orders (Beals, 1955). The main concern of the peasant Mexicans was not nationalist goals nor support for an indigenous movement; rather, simple survival was uppermost in the minds of nearly all Mexican families. Economic conditions continued to worsen, and by the end of the World War I period, the common laborer--including most all Indians not in tribal enclaves--were far worse off than at any time since Mexico's independence. It was no accident that these two decades following 1900 produced the largest waves of Mexican immigrants to the United States throughout its history. They came not for freedom or equality--they came for employment to buy food and clothing, unavailable to them in their homeland. Within that same decade Mexico began a program of internal reconstruction, setting as a top priority the nationwide coordination of rural education. In 1923, against the desires of top Education officials, governmental officers were organized to accelerate the acculturation of heretofore "uncontaminated" Indian communities, an extension of the doctrine of Mexican homogeneity through total assimilation.

Significantly, it was not in the ministry of Education where the seeds of cultural pluralism germinated but in the relatively obscure division of Anthropology and Regional Population within the Agricultural ministry. Manuel Gamio, a noted Mexican anthropologist, was implementing the Teotihuacán project which encouraged self-development among the citizenry and retention of pride in their cultural heritage. The ideas contained within this pilot program, aimed at Indian betterment, were adopted by President Cárdenas who, in 1939, repudiated the previous ignominious coercion of the Yaqui Indians and established for their use an exclusive territory on some of their former ancestral lands in Northern Mexico. The following year, under his sponsorship, all the Pan American countries met at Pátzcuaro for what was to be only the first Congress of Indigenous Peoples, with more to follow. According to Aguirre Beltrán, one of the most significant actions of this Congress was the formal adoption of the principle of cultural pluralism stated as follows:

> Only upon a consideration of cultural relativism can eminently constructive social action be founded (1953:48).

The doctrine of cultural pluralism, the right to be proud of one's Indian ancestry, was at last officially national policy. The "conquest psychology" operative under pre-Aztec, Aztec, Spanish and Mexican rule had been replaced by a more compromising stand promising the retention of Indian languages and customs alongside the official Spanish language and Mexican culture.

The Instituto National Indigenista was created in 1948 under article Ten of the earlier first Indigenous Congress. It was dedicated to the gathering and popularizing of Indian contributions to Mexican culture and Mexican history. Immigrants to the United States, caught up in the general indigenous movement now gaining momentum, diffused this dogma into borderland barrios. This diffusion of nativism from Mexico to the United States occurred much later than claimed by one Mexican American authority who stated that Mexican immigrants carried cultural pluralism into U.S. barrios thirty years earlier than it even existed in Mexico. (Romano-V., 1967:37). In 1949, Cuauhtémoc, the last Aztec monarch[18] was officially proclaimed as the new symbol of the Mexican nation (Haddox, 1970:15). Now the stage has been set for an overt nativistic emphasis in the American Southwest.

Although most of the northern Indian tribes located in the territory now corresponding to the United States are not as directly involved in the Mexican American lineage as those of Mexico and Central America, they must be included in our analysis, if nothing more than to bring them together with militant Chicanos in the revolts of the 1960s. Although Amerinds (short version of American Indian, to distinguish them from Citizens of India) shared much the same fate of extermination and exploitation from Anglo Europeans as those further South from the Spaniards, there are also distinct differences in their conquest and colonial history. First, the Indian population of North America was very sparse compared to the concentrated populations of Meso-America and Central Mexico. Compared to the 25 million aboriginal inhabitants in the Southlands, only about 850,000 estimated Amerinds were scattered over the present United States (Josephy, 1968:50). Moreover, it was the Spanish pattern of conquest

and colonization to exploit both the lands and the people together, which resulted in a greater blending of racial and cultural legacies. The Anglo orientation was to divest the land of its indigenous inhabitants in order to own and exploit the land itself. Therefore, it is no accident that Spanish colonial penetration into the Southwest occurred in the relatively populated region of northern New Mexico and scarcely anywhere else in the north country.

American Indians (frequently referred to as "the American Indian") constitute what remains of more than 600 separate Indian societies at the coming of the white Man (Collier, 1947:100-101). These were small, autonomous groups for the most part, speaking a hundred different languages and dialects. Unlike the conquistadores in South America, Indian interpreters used in northern explorations met far more unknown tongues than the number of languages they actually knew. Just as the Spaniard colonists in Mexico had done before them, the Anglo colonists coming to North America brought with them the racist dogmas of Europe. These were put into operation far less subtlely than they were under the highly centralized Spanish viceroyalties in the South. The belief in "Manifest Destiny", God's intention that this land from one coast to the other be united under a single national banner, blinded the European immigrants at their arrival to the plight of the Indians who were already using the land.

The Pilgrims and early Spanish, Dutch and Portuguese explorers reported their first meetings with indigenous peoples as amicable. But the overly romanticized versions of the early colonial era extant in American histories create the false impression that the Indians anxiously awaited the coming of the White Man to exploit their lands to the fullest--something which Anglo historians inferred that the Indian could not do himself. The quaint legend of Samoset, Massasoit, Squanto and Hobamah as they extended aid to the Pilgrim Fathers is illustrative. Massasoit encouraged the colonists to settle in a large area recently depopulated by a mysterious disease. Yet the racist, Cotton Mather, in the following phrase interprets this generous gesture as the deference of an inferior race to a superior one.

> The woods were almost cleared of those pernicious creatures, to make room for a better growth (Collier, 1947:115).

The tremendous diversity of language, culture and spatical occupancy patterns among existing Indian societies had created traditional rivalries which were used by the Dutch, French, Spanish and British immigrants to their own advantage. Also this fragmentation of indigenous peoples precluded any realistic inter-tribal military consolidation which might seriously threaten even small groups of well equipped European military forces. Because of the atomized nature of the northern American Indian tribes, a far more complex system of land purchases, treaties and agreements occurred than in the South where new Spanish elite were substituted for Aztec elite who had replaced former sovereigns. In the English colonies in 1754, the Crown took over the task of officially dealing with the Indian leaders and their policy was that since each Indian nation was an independent entity, it deserved protection which was offered under the paternal guidance of the Crown. The colonists were to continue this policy of dependency down through the modern era to the present.

The next century of history is summarized as follows.

> After the day of rival imperialism was over, however, there remained only one expanding empire, race-prejudiced and with a boundless land hunger. The former policies toward Indian societies and Indianhood became reversed; a policy at first implicit and sporadic, then explicit, elaborately rationalized and complexly implemented, of the extermination of Indian societies and of every Indian trait, of the eventual liquidation of Indians became the formalized policy, law and practice (Collier, 1947:103).

Though government, Church and private groups attempted to "civilize" the Indian through education and assimilation, alongside this were active advocates of the ruthless "conquest and annihilation" policies already cited.

By the early decades of the Nineteenth Century it was clear that the dominant mood of the nation was for eventual racial and territorial separation. Andrew Jackson was an ardant supporter of Indian removal and relocation as the only means of preserving Indian peoples from extinction. Following his election, he sent to Congress in 1829 a program for Indian relocation--"removal"--to lands west of the Mississippi (present day Kansas and Oklahoma), these to be traded for deeds to lands upon which they then lived and upon which settlers and soldiers of fortune were encroaching. At this same time, Indian relocation from the North Central states to the Oklahoma territory had already begun. Jackson concluded his Congressional appeal with the following hope.

> After the further details of the arrangements are completed, with a very general supervision over them, they ought to be left to the progress of events. These, I indulge the hope, will secure their prosperity and improvement; and a large portion of the moral debt we owe them will be paid (quoted in Smith, 1965:360).

Even before the legislation was passed in 1830, white settlers had expropriated so much of the original land that other substitute areas had to be designated for Indian reserved lands or reservations. These hundreds of distinct Indian groups from Massachusetts to Florida, from Minnesota to Louisiana, were then "relocated" into contiguous specific areas many thus losing their identity and language to stronger, larger tribes nearby. Those who went to the land prescribed without resistance were called "good Indians" while those who resisted were "bad Indians." By the end of the 1840 decade, practically all of the "good Indians" had been relocated and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, organized without Congressional approval by John C. Calhoun, Secretary of the War Department, had become their initial (and perpetual) federal guardian.

Following the debilitating Civil War, the military might of the United States was deployed to the West to round up the "bad Indians" and herd them onto their designated territories, or to exterminate them. Those Plains Indians whose societies were based upon a hunting economy were most resistant inasmuch as the adaptation to sedentary life without game to hunt was too severe an adjustment in their life style. Campaigns were launched from 1865 to 1885 in the Southwest to rid the area of the troublesome

Apache and Comanche warriors. Campaigns against the Cheyenne and the last major holdouts, the Sioux nation, were conducted during roughly this same period. From this era comes the "cowboy and Indian" or "soldier and Indian" movie plots which always characterize the Indians as sneaky and ready to massacre innocent Whites, whereas empirically the reverse appeared to be the case (Brown, 1971). One of the salient Anglo themes depicting existing attitudes toward Indians emerged from this era. On the occasion of an Indian informer being brought before General Sheridan, pointing out that he was a "good Indian" (i.e. cooperative), the General is reputed to have responded--"the only good Indians I ever saw were dead." (Brown, 1971:166).

The 132 million acres of Indian lands held in trust by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1887 had declined to about 32 million acres by 1929. The many conflicting treaties, legislation, BIA interpretations, etc., covering land ownership by tribal councils, lands in severality, and direct allotments to off-reservation Indians is a confusing hodge-podge even little understood within the Bureau itself. Different regulations between "ward" Indians and "citizen" Indians were developed (Officer, 1971:23-35) although the 1880 Indian stereotype was still the popular, negative image held by the larger society and romanticized in histories and novels.

During the period of 1933-1941 a distinct shift in Indian procedures was introduced by the new Bureau chief, John Collier (now operating under the auspices of the Department of Interior.) Tribal integrity, the maintenance of Indian culture and personal dignity were basic elements of that policy. Indians raised during that period who were taught to respect "the old ways" would provide ethnic leadership for Indian militants in the 1960s[20] seeking to preserve the right to live "the old ways".

Following World War II, Indian education and off-reservation employment programs were designed to more fully bring Amerinds into full citizenship and to share in the advantages of the larger society. Some Indian youth, such as Vine Deloria, sought to "beat the Anglo at his own game" by becoming better educated and better skilled than they, but he ultimately became disenchanted with Anglo policies even those toward educated Indians (Josephy, 1971:241-242). Social adjustment to living in modern society was full of stresses as "the weaning of Amerinds" was renewed. Indians who had been trained for dependency on tribal reservations, with special institutions and treatment, became militantly angry against the BIA for its "failure to provide them the same range of services provided their reservation kinsmen" (Officer, 1971:56-57). The Black Power and Brown Power moods were followed rapidly by that of Red Power (Josephy, 1971:2-7). Through the public exposure given to minority problems during the zenith of the Great Society programs, uncensored utterances of Indian discontent such as the explosive speech made by Melvin Thom at the American Indian Capital Conference on Poverty (Josephy, 1971:53-57) awakened the public conscience. The dramatic takeover by Indian militants of Alcatraz Island in December 1969 gave further credence to renewed Indian demands to be liberated from bureaucratic servitude and to be compensated for past maltreatment to indigeneous peoples by Whites coming to this country.

Mexican American interest in Indian affairs (other than mutual pledges of support between militant segments of each group) was never realistically tied to the historical plights of the Amerinds but rather an identification with peoples of darker skin as a symbolic rejection of racist dogmas inherent within the "Spanish" identity. Organized mestizo-indian identity was inauspiciously begun with the Mexica Movement (pronounced "Mex-chica" in the Aztec fashion) becoming more visible in the mid-1950s in Southern

California (Forbes, 1968:66-67) strictly identifying with ancient Mexican, not ancient or current North American, peoples. Also, more recently, the 175 students at Texas A & I who changed their registration cards from "Mexican American" the previous semester to "Indian" are exhibiting symbolic protests, not realistic Indian ties from knowledge of Indian lore or historical and cultural similarity. The campus-based Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MECHA), the most prominent organization proposing the basic tenets of the Mexica Movement, is also emotionally and metaphysically tied to the legendary Aztecs rather than to empirical Indian cultures of today. This will be explored further in the section dealing with Aztlán.

The revolt of the younger generations against their more traditional elders symbolized by the Black "Uncle Toms", the Chicano "Tío Tomases" and the Indian "Uncle Tomahawk" tribal leaders, creates the false impression that these three groups share a great deal in common, which they do not. Behind the Civil Rights color code (Black-Power, Brown-Power, Red-Power, Yellow-Power, etc.,) lies a wide spectrum of cultural, historical and identity differences which cannot be bridged by one tenuous bond such as a common hatred toward Anglo domination. Each of these groups is searching for a distinct facet of self-identity.

Blacks have no crisis with identity as American citizens. They have amalgamated to the point of having English for their mother tongue as well as many generations of contact with the social institutions of the larger society (albeit until recent decades in an inferior role.) They now seek to regain their lost languages, cultures and histories which disappeared with the first generation of slaves--when Blacks were paired up and bred by size and slave ownership rather than as nuclear families with common language or culture.

Browns (Mexican Americans) have little difficulty relating to their Mother Tongue, Spanish; and the nearness of Mexico and its culture is enough to give them a permanent reinforcement of those institutions and customs, especially in the borderland region juxtaposition to the Southern U.S. boundary. Their identity difficulties lie in being rejected as full-fledged citizens, even those who are born in the United States or whose family has been American citizens for many generations.

Reds (Amerinds) have little problem identifying with the schoolboy's story of "the First Thanksgiving in America" or with Indian "Reservations." They have more difficulty identifying with their ancient tribal lands from which they were forceably "relocated" during the 1830-1840 decades. Moreover, because of their perennial dependency as "wards of the state" and separatist policies directed toward them by the Congressional government Indian bureaus and their representatives, many tribes have been retained as integral units, preserving some of their ancestral customs and beliefs which were not retained by immigrant minorities (Lieberson, 1961: 910) and amalgamated Indian-Spanish mestizos of New [illegible]. Many Indians are able to speak their ancestral language, with which few non-tribal members are even familiar.

Organizational efforts to consolidate Indian strength nationwide

resulted in at least two prominent organizations--the more traditional National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) and the more change-oriented National Indian Youth Council (NIYC). Indians who have left the reservations for urban areas have joined together in a nationwide federation called American Indians United (AIU). Some highly militant groups which are consistently cited in the news these days are the American Indian Movement (AIM), some of whose membership engineered the take-over of the reservation at Wounded Knee, S.D. on March 1st of this year, and the United Native Americans, Inc. (UNA). But just as it was during the early colonization period, Indian tribal customs differ so widely that regional organizations, which reflect more clearly the cultural background of a few single tribes or a large Indian Nation, far more united and culturally homogenous and are therefore potentially more effective. These regional and tribal groups vary in their orientations from reactionary traditional authority to a full dedication to militancy. But though the means differ between these groups, most of them are pledged to accelerate the process of restoring self-determination back to the Indian people themselves by means of breaking the paternalistic bonds of bureaucratic overseers thereby acquiring a similar status accorded to other "free minorities" who are not special wards of the state.

It must be remembered that only a dozen years have passed since Amerinds in the Southwest had full States Suffrage, the same rights granted to them by the federal government nearly one-half century ago.[21] Their movement appears to be very near the same stage as the Mexican Indigenous Movement was at the time President Cárdenas declared the doctrine of cultural pluralism. In the United States cultural pluralism is still not policy, even for Mexican Americans, but President Nixon's 1970 message to Congress (Josephy, 1971:211-230) does call for increased Indian participation in making decisions directly affecting their own destiny. This is a step closer to self-determination, ethnic autonomy and greater Indian pride.

Thus, in summary, it appears that the Indian identification movement stressed among younger Mexican Americans is more symbolic of a reaction against dark-skin prejudice than a result of communality of culture. Mexican American pride of Indian ancestry refers to darker skinned mestizo lineage which was adapted to Spanish culture under many centuries of Iberian domination. It does not extend realistically to the hundreds of Amerind societies scattered throughout North America at the coming of the White Man. The Mexican American scarcely knows about the myriads of Amerind societies. In fact, few Amerind leaders themselves from among the many tribal groups know substantial amounts of each other's culture or can speak to each other in the indigenous languages of the past.

5) "1848 (Mexican)" Image

This viewpoint, just as its Anglo counterpart--the "1848 (Anglo)" image--accepts the period of the Mexican War and the Cession of the Southwest Territory as the crucible from which Mexican American identity was created. As expressed by Álvarez,

The coming into being of the Mexican-American people is a totally

different psycho-historical experience. The Mexican-American people were created abruptly, virtually overnight, because Mexico suffered military defeat...This rapid change must, certainly, have given them a different social-psychological view of self than they had prior to the break (1971:19).

Explicitly or implicitly, other Mexican American scholars write with this viewpoint as their point of departure (Almaráz, 1969: Chavarría, 1970; Cuellar, 1970; Rocco, 1971) and while pointing out the erroneous notions contained within the "1848 (Anglo)" version of history, they themselves unknowingly perpetuate this same fallacious assumption--that Mexican Americans and their history commence with the Mexican War and its outcome.

Prior to the last decade, only rarely did scholars give more than a passing criticism of the dominant Anglo interpretation of Mexican American subjugation and the cultural, historical legacy of the Southwest. One clear exception was Carey McWilliams (1943; 1969) who documented with accuracy the injustices being openly heaped upon Americans of Mexican and Spanish descent, during an era when it was not fashionable to write in an anti-establishment fashion. During the early years of World War II, the late George I. Sanchez wrote of the northern New Mexico region and its Forgotten People (1940) who were neglected by their adopting parent, America.. But for nearly two decades, his was a lone voice in the wilderness. This paucity of writing about Spanish Americans and Mexican Americans has suddenly changed and a few significant contributions (along with a plethora of warmed over romanticized versions of the "1848 (Anglo" stereotype) have been published recently, including a sizable number by Mexican American scholars and educators. Some of the most forthright and clearest exposés of Anglo stereotypy describing Southwestern peoples and their culture were written by Octavio Romano-V. (1967; 1968; 1969). Although they were presented as penetrating emotional discourses on the failings of pseudo-scientific writers, these essays accurately (and caustically) presented legitimate arguments against many "Anglo experts" whose writings dominate the Mexican American bibliographies today. Some of these were openly identified by name, as well as the thesis each had advanced; Ruth Tuck, Lyle Saunders, Munro Edmonson, Cecilia Heller, Florence Kluckhohn, William Madsen, Julian Samora and others were systematically dissected. His summary of their overall contribution reads thusly:

> [For these writers] Mexican-American culture represents a retreat, whereas acculturation represents creativity and change...[They have] distorted history, essentially rewrote history and perpetuated the concept of an ahistoric people, the "somnolent, passive Mexican"...
>
> Contemporary social scientists [are] busily perpetuating the very same opinions of Mexican culture that were current during the Mexican-American American War (1968:14, 16, 24).

Another Mexican American scholar, Nick Vaca (1970a; 1970b) clearly documented the absurdities of the "value orientation" whole-culture stereotype as was discussed earlier in this essay. Casavantes (1969) and Guzmán (1967) also protested the ascription of dependency, fatalism and paternalism as basic Mexican values, complaining about those who confuse the "culture of poverty", operative in most lower class Mexican American barrios, with the Mexican cultural heritage in which ethnic members may

truly take pride.

Although there is a solid argument against the distorted "1848 (Anglo)" view and critics universally agree that it is in urgent need of clarification, the nostalgic writings of the would-be reformers have created a fantasy of a "Golden Age of Mexico" which is equally inaccurate in describing the cultural and social conditions of the pre-Anglo period both in Mexico and the Southwest Territory. A brief review of these circumstances will point out the alleged disparities.

Our previous discussions extensively documented the internal exploitation and inhuman treatment of Indians and lower mestizo castes in Mexico by the Spanish Creoles and the select mestizo elites who permeated the upper social castes. At the time of Mexico's Independence, these combined elite, comprising perhaps less than five percent of the total population of the Republic, were living in comparative luxury--enjoying the Spanish architecture, art forms, music and literary accomplishments appropriate to their noble station. But for the remaining masses of the clase popular (lower class), heywere serving their lives in debt peonage and other exploitive institutional forms left as a legacy of more than three centuries of Spanish rule, poverty, disease; and a subsistance level of existence was their life. It was from these impoverished masses, not from the comfortable elite, that the bulk of Mexican immigrants came to the agricultural fields, mines, ranches and railroad camps throughout the Southwest. The conditions they left behind in Mexico could hardly be considered a "Golden Age" even in the most favorable light, although their experience in the Southwest during half a century of Anglo discrimination and intolerance could hardly be considered much of an improvement.

Social conditions and the basic setting for developing a strong sense of ethnic pride was likewise somewhat rare in the Southwest, though the prominence of Spanish surname elite in New Mexico and among the Californios calls for a more extensive clarification of the different colonization strategies employed in the four separate regions of California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. Because Spanish colonialism was based upon a system of exploiting both land and resident indigenous peoples, (Gibson, 1966: 194-196) the only large concentration of population for this type of large-scale colonialism was the river valleys of the Chama and Rio Grande with its 50,000 Pueblo Indians. In the remainder of the Southwest, the sparsely populated areas of California and Arizona (and only an early token effort in Texas) called for early Mission penetration with secular administration being installed subsequently. Under the direction of Fray Junípero Serra, the California Franciscan missions brought the rich valleys of Southern California and the Indians to work them under their firm control. Father Keno and the Jesuits, until their expulsion from the New World in the 1760s, had established a thin line of mission settlements from the southern regions the Santa Cruz river in Sonora northward to the Gila, where maurading bands of Apaches prevented further penetration. At the time of Mexican Independence, only three small settlements at San Antonio, Nacogdoches and La Bahía remained to administer and control the vast Tejas territory. In all of these Southwestern colonial systems, there were few elites and many laborers, chiefly the Indian-mestizo families. Here, as in Mexico following the conquest and subjugation of indigenous tribal societies, racial and

ethnic pride was a luxury for the upper castes and classes, not a common possession of the masses. This can be noted more fully from the somewhat detailed "reformed" history of the Southwest which follows.

A correct historical account of the Southwest territory cannot begin with the advent of Anglo gold-seekers, traders and settlers flooding into the region in the mid-Nineteenth Century. Neither can it commence with the Cession of this land by Mexico following the War of 1846. To be sure some of the early Spanish exploration by gold-seeking Conquistadores was but a prelude to permanent colonization to follow; the advent of colonization and exploitation of lands and indigenous peoples by Europeans begins more than 200 years prior to the Anglo domination of the Southwest.

It was in 1598 when Don Juan de Oñate, with 83 wagons, hundreds of men and thousands of cattle journeyed from Central Mexico northward up the Rio Grande beyond El Paso del Norte into northern New Mexico. There he founded his communities in the vicinity of present day Santa Fe and subjugated the Pueblos and confiscated their lands for himself and the Spanish Crown. The heavy tribute demanded of the resident Indians, their loss of land, and the rapid depopulation (to one-sixth of their original number) brought about great unrest and eventual revolt among the Pueblos. It was almost a full century from this first excursion northward until the territory was again firmly under Spanish rule (Moquin, 1971a). By 1800, these areas were still "islands of civilization in the midst of savagery" with recently armed Indians on the warpath, embittered by a long history of harsh and punitive treatment from the Spanish (Meinig, 1971:14-15).

Subsequent expansion into the adjoining regions of Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and the Texas panhandle in the mid-1800s was blunted by cattlemen from the East and West and Mormon colonists on the North. Santa Fe, being the southernmost point of the Santa Fe trail leading to midwest and Eastern U.S. markets, was being coveted by Eastern-based enterprises. The intermittant contact with Chihuahua City to the South was not strong enough to interdict these eastern trade ties. Following the Cession in 1848, nearly every Southwest trade center had representatives of Eastern enterprises which, following the railroad penetration into the area in the 1870-1880's, began an Anglo economic takeover of land and resources.

Unlike the "1848 (Mexican)" image version of the Southwest territory being ripped away from its Mexican moorings, the historical facts show a far different story. Sanchez (1940:9-11) claims that the northern New Mexico villages were so far from the central seat of power in Mexico that hardly a ripple occurred in Santa Fe when the Cession changeover occurred. The United States claim to ownership was only the last of many successive "protective governments" which had all been ineffectual in politically integrating this isolated area into their total political system. During the period from Mexican Independence in 1821 to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo twenty seven years later, the newly formed Mexico regime, knowing little of the northern lands or its inhabitants, had given enormous land grants to select members of their elite families for compensation and support during the revolt. Other land grants were given aspiring men anxious to direct the colonization and securing of these lands for the new regime and for their personal exploitation. These grants were mostly East of the Rio

Grande in areas not yet fully under traditional Spanish control. Thus, the northern New Mexico settlements, more than two centuries under Spanish domination and as such culturally and linguistically Spanish (but genetically mestizo) were never Mexican in any but the most legalistic sense, and that only less than three decades.

In California, Arizona and Texas, Spanish penetration took the form of the establishment of missions. The Jesuits were the earliest, in the late 1600s until their explusion. They established communities in Sonora up the Santa Cruz River extending as far north as Tucson (Wax, 1971:11). They worked mostly among the Papago (Pima) Indians and were well received. The expulsion of the Jesuit Order from the New World in 1767, combined with the hostility of Apache bands roaming the north and central Arizona plains, blunted further colonial expansion in that area.

In California, Fray Junípero Serra was commissioned in 1769 to establish the first of 21 Franciscan missions along the Pacific slope; this at San Diego. The Spanish Crown feared possible Russian encroachment from Alaska and by establishing mission colonies hoped to construct a territorial perimeter. The Franciscan missions were authorized by, and therefore owed their loyalty to the Spanish Crown, thus largely ignoring the leadership in Mexico City which the missionaries considered dissident Creole-mestizo "rabble". By the year 1800, the Church owned nearly all of the choice California valley land, and had used the menial labor of its "Christianized" Indians to build up farmlands, animal herds, vineyards and orchards. They were, essentially, independent social and economic systems. (Moquin, 1971b; 1971c).

When Mexico gained her Independence, the Franciscan loyalty to the Spanish Crown was not forgotten and was negatively rewarded. Within a single decade the vast Church domains had become "secularized", enabling upper class families from Spain and her dominions which arrived in California during the last half of the Eighteenth century to become a landed aristocracy--the Californios, elite "First Families" of the southern California region (Moquin, 1971j). Not only had the Californias obtained old Spanish land grants and shared in the secular transfer of Church lands to Mexican and private own ownership, but some were granted new land grants issued by the government in Mexico City (Moquin, 1971f) which would eventually have to be legally claimed and legitimized following Cession and the admission of California as a territory of the United States. But just as the Spanish Friars had dispossessed the indigenous Indian groups, and had been, in turn, dispossessed by the Californios, the inundation of Anglo immigrants to California caused by the Gold Rush, the cattle boom, and the emergent territorial government following the Cession, found the Spanish elite being separated from their land through economic indebtedness and legalistic questioning of their grant claims. According to territorial law, all land grants had to be processed and legitimized by means of owner-initiated formal legal claims. Some of these grants, initially only vaguely described and with overlapping boundaries, were lost or reduced in acreage (Moquin, 1971h; 1971i; Pitt, 1970).

The loss to Mexico of Texas is likewise shrouded in historical mythology of the "1848 (Anglo)" version and partially perpetuated, though in

slightly altered form under the "1848 (Mexican)" version of history. As a brief background it is noted that early forays into East Texas had been made by Spanish missionaries. When the French ceded Louisiana in 1762, the threat of French encroachment to that area was gone. Economic pressures on the Crown caused a complete withdrawal of garrisons and missions from the area, with the exception of the three central missions of San Antonio, La Bahía and Nacogdoches. These administrative cadre and accompanying garrisons[22] were the total sum of "Mexican control" existent at the time of Texas colonization and subsequent independence.

Following Mexico's Independence, its leadership was extremely anxious to populate the Tejas territory. With the shadow of rebellion and the centuries of racial stigma and perceived incompetency among their own Indian and mestizo peoples, their preferences for colonizing peoples were for those of Europe, or Americans (Moquin, 1971e). To these were extended land grants liberally for the eventual purpose of building up thriving colonies over which the Mexican government might then exert authority. However, when these small colonies became increasingly in- losing its already tenuous control. Therefore, in 1830 it issued a decree banning all further immigration into Texas from the United States, hoping to avoid a continuous flow of potentially disloyal subjects. But by this time both Anglo and Spanish landholders were politically repulsed by the dictatorial methods and extremely centralized authority taken upon himself by Santa Anna. Feeling that they could best protect their investment by severing their allegiance with the faction-torn, fledgling government headquartered in far away Mexico City. Texas independence was declared in 1836; and Santa Anna, fresh from his victories over Zapotec uprisings in the south, was eager to crush this impudent display of disloyalty. The massacre at the Alamo became a shibboleth of unity for loyal Texians[23] and Texans alike. The romantic novels of the frontier written many decades later departed from the documented events as they happened (Sanchez Lamego, 1968: 37; Moquin, 1971g) and misplaced heroics were attributed to men such as the immortalized Jim Bowie. The raging battles for Texas separatism were later rewritten as distorted accounts of superior Anglo heroism and military generalship pitted against Mexican cowardice and ineffectiveness. In reality, the decisive battle San Jacinto was a saga featuring an all star cast--an egocentric leader, Santa Anna, on the brink of disaster, unseasonally frigid weather coupled with extended forced marches of support troops under his direction, and significant military blunders being committed by him and his commanders in their desire for an instantaneous victory (Moquin, 1971g). Underlying the desperation for an immediate victory was the ideological battle raging between two governmental factions in Mexico itself. The "Centralist" group, with Santa Anna as their spokesman, desired a highly centralized, monolithic form of government reminiscent of the Spanish Empire. The "Federationists" wished to create a decentralized government coordinating sovereign regional units. Within the military ranks both officers and men were deserting from one faction to the other, being wooed by promises of better wages and increased advantages. The very night prior to the attach at San Jacinto, a large defection among Santa Anna's overwhelming forces occurred, mistakenly interpreted as an illustration of Mexican cowardice under fire. "Inadvertently" absent even from the historical accounts of the bravery of Texas soldiers are the exploits of Juan Seguín and his 30 Tejanos who led the cavalry charge at San Jacinto, and the many Mexican American soldiers whofwere fighting against theiroown brothers in Santa Annas Mexican Army. Likewise omitted

ere the heroics of those Mexican Americans who gave their lives in defense of the Alamo (Almaráz, 1969:13; I.T.C., 1971) and the many other Texians who fought alongside the Texas Anglos under Anglo commanders. It is significant that the singular legacy of Mexican contributions to the Southwest liberation is the many tales of "Mexican outlaws"(Cuellar,1970).

There were no other support troops to save Santa Anna and he lost the battle which determined the control of the Texas territory. Mexican leaders immediately began to focus their attention on their internal "revolution" and to ignore the remainder of the Southwest territory for the time being. The brief control of Texas by Mexico (1821-1836) and the short span of ownership over the remaining portion of the Southwest Territory (1821-1846) shows the Cession to be a titular transfer instead of the often imputed surgical amputation by American butchers operating on a gloriously rich and contented people of the neophyte Mexican Republic.

The "1848 (Mexican)" notion of a Mexican "Golden Age" existing prior to Anglo exploitation following the Mexican War is nearly as inaccurate as the earlier Anglo "rewritten history." It is clear that a full three centuries of Spanish colonization and missions influence are the principle cultural heritage of the present Southwest, far more important in tracing institutional values or a cultural history than the brief 15-37 years of "symbolic control" by Mexico. Throughout Mexico and the United States earlier Empires have risen and decayed as subsequent groups became dominant. The segmentation and exploitation of Mexican Indians and mestizos is not an exclusive property of today's Anglo society. It can be traced in stages from Tepanec exploitation of Aztecs, of Aztec exploitation of their tribute peoples, of Spanish exploitation of and miscegination with earlier Indian dynasties, of Creole-spawned revolt to form the Mexican Republic, and subsequent domination by the American Anglos. Thus, this titular transfer of territory from one dominant group to another, in this case, the Southwest Territory has a history thousands of years old and is not just a unique case of "land rape" created and perpetuated by Anglos against Mexicans.

In summary, it is evident that the "1848 (Mexican)" image is really symbolic evidence of Mexican American discontent rather than an accurate view of history. Mexican American disgust and hostility toward the Anglo society for past indignities creates an emotional overload--an objective myopia--from which they mistakenly perceive the "symptoms" to be the "causes" of current inequities. Thus, many current Chicano liberals and radicals flail away at Anglo society for having created prejudice against Mexican Americans whereas technically they but faithfully continued these exploitive practices exhibited earlier by pre-Aztec, Aztec, Spanish and Mexican tyrannies. However, this historical clarification does not seek to absolve Anglo Americans from guilt because of their past insensitiveness toward Mexican Americans nor from their past discriminatory practices against this minority. Rather, it openly declares that these stereotypes of racial and cultural superiority--learned from past dynasties--can be "unlearned". Ascribed inferiority of non-Anglo minorities, being of ethnocentric origin and false, must be discarded e'er self delusion becomes the source of societal decay in American Anglo society.

6) Chicanos

The Chicano Movement is a misnomer inasmuch as it is comprised of various "movements" within it (Sena Rivera, 1972), having vastly different identity

bases. It began as a younger generation phenomenon during the early 1960s, reached its peak at the end of the decade, and subsided into a less volatile entity at present. This section will be directed toward outlining the historical context[24] in which the Chicano generation evolved and against what previous imagery they directed their energies.

At the beginning of the 20th century, a mere 200,000 persons of Mexican descent resided within the United States boundaries. Then in those years preceding and following the Mexican Revolution of 1910, vast numbers of Mexican immigrants streamed into the United States borderlands in search of temporary escape from the internal hostilities, and for work to provide for their families (Cline 1963:24-30). Most families intended to return to Mexico following the end of open military conflict. These families were almost exclusively the uneducated masses, having recently escaped from generations of debt peonage. They were employed in U. S. agriculture, some becoming agricultural migrants as opportunities for seasonal work became available on a predicted harvest timetable in different geographical regions. Some families were fortunate enough to drop out of the migrant stream early. Others became endebted to it much like the debt peonage practices of their former homeland and their children had little opportunity for formal school or training for stable, steady occupations.

Preceding the advent of World War I, many European immigrants of former years--called hyphenated-Americans (Higham, 1970)--were called upon to demonstrate their loyalty toward America's World War I enemies. This meant giving up their German, Italian, Irish, or other national identity language and become "100% Americans." Among many Mexican immigrant families, their desire to be adopted by their new homeland resulted in a similar decision to no longer speak Spanish nor relate to their former homeland. Organizations flourished among them which were both patriotic and were dedicated to assist Mexicans in acquiring American citizenship or to gain the necessary English skills. The LULAC confederation was an outgrowth of some earlier patriotic organizations spawned during this period. Visible gestures of being a loyal American were stressed, (i.e., a desire for formal education, exclusive speaking of English, voluntary military service and the like.) From these early families emerged a large number of the middle class Mexican American families who, by the era of World War II, had achieved upward mobility to become small business proprietors, professionals, and skilled workers; and with the economic base to send their children on to higher education. These manifested the attitude toward their fellow ethnic group--"I did it through hard work, and so can you!"

At this same time, the vast bulk of Mexican immigrants were still laboring in the fields, oblivious to all identity problems; fearing instead the economic realities of poverty and potential starvation. The Depression treated nearly everyone badly but none suffered as did the Mexican alien (McWilliams, 1933) and the unacculturated Mexican American laborers. But the depression came to a close as the United States became an ally and then an active participant in the Second World War. World War II pumped new economic prosperity into the American economy and both urban occupational opportunities and military service available to Mexican Americans provided a relatively affluent life, especially for the non-rural Mexican American population with formal education and technical skills. Large numbers of rural

residents who had not moved into the city previously became urban residents with increased opportunities for formal education denied their migrant worker or immigrant Mexican parents. This partial "Anglecization" produced a generation who knew what opportunities were available for Anglos and what were not available for minority group members. They felt that their fathers had paid too high a price for potential Anglo acceptance (which they found to be only tokenism, at best.) Rather than accepting second-class American status, returning ethnic servicemen and educated urban Mexican Americans attempted to withdraw from Anglo society in order to build their own institutions, patterned after the ones in the dominant society. Thus, the dominant orientation of this era became one of "ethnic separatism." This rejection of Anglo society did not call for its abolishment or destruction; only that Mexican Americans would no longer join Anglo organizations, support Anglo projects, vote according to Anglo desires etc. Of the many social and fraternal ethnic organizations formed, one of the most active and influential of that period was the American G.I. Forum. This organization, resulting from unified effort at legal reform of discriminatory practices, was successful in gaining a greater share of America's abundance, but its members could not acquire total equality in Anglo society.

The generation of children reared in an urban setting by "separatist" parents became even more aware of what was happening throughout the entire Southwest, throughout the nation, and throughout the World. The activism in support of Civil Rights beckoned them and as it gained momentum during the late 1950s, they heard Black and White radical leaders calling for a complete destruction of American racist institutions--upon the ashes of which a new non-racist society might be built. They perceived the abrupt change of Blacks who formerly exhibited "self hatred" for their dark skin, now proudly displaying their color as a symbol of status. That minority was defining their own criteria for beauty, and they proclaimed--"Black is beautiful!" Younger Mexican Americans began to model their own means and goals after those displayed by the Black Power movement. They began to perceive that the American social system was not a vehicle for upward mobility, but rather an obstacle between them and their future goals (Peñalosa, 1967:414). Mexican Americans began to glory in the overt repudiation of Anglo values, of Anglo-dominated institutions, laws, histories, values and images. As their ethnic pride became linked to an anti-Anglo orientation, they more easily adopted the strategies of Black Power for their own Brown Power (or Chicano Power) objectives. Inherent within this ideology was the necessity to purge Chicano culture of its Anglo elements. Traditional Anglo heroes were repudiated and deference was shown to Mexican bravados (later Chicano contemporary heroes), and the glorification of those very labels, images, and attitudes which had been devalued by Anglo society. In this context, the term Chicano was self-bestowed because of its negative connotation in Anglo society. This became a means to show the contempt Mexican Americans held for [illegible] judgments and evaluations especially of their ethnic minority (Cockcroft, 1969:16). Chicanismo was born.

Though some authors (Mar, 1970) stress that the Chicano movement was not in existence prior to 1966, its message had been proclaimed openly prior to that time. Chronologically, the earliest of these spokesman was Reies Lopez Tijerina who early in the 1960s, was challenging the formalized institutions of New Mexico and the entire United States in his land grant War. Subsequently other Chicano heroes came to the fore. The

non-violent precision of the National Farm Workers Organizing Committee (NFWOC) and their Southern California labor boycotts showed the organizing skill of César Chavez. The politicization of Mexican Americans in California (MAPA) with Bert Corona and in the Texas lower valley with José Angel Gutierrez of MAYO and La Raza Unida; the symbolic impact of the uniformed Brown Berets led by David Sanchez; and the emotional charisma of the sports hero/poet Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales, under his Crusade for Justice banner in Denver, all served as hero models for the rising generation of Chicano youth.[25] Sports heroes such as golfer Lee Trevino and quarterback Jim Plunkett, popular singers such as Vicki Carr and other VIP Mexican Americans in government and business were substituted for Mickey Mantle, Horatio Alger, George Washington, John D. Rockefeller and similar "unknowns." Historical legends and traditions were constantly being challenged, as the following paraphrase of a poem reminiscent of what a young Mexican lad sitting in a history class, confused, might say to himself.

My country's Father; Washington?
I quickly raise la mano
If Washington my Father was,
Why was he not Chicano?

Chicano attitudes as to how they perceived themselves in 1963 had, by 1968 shifted perceptibly--not so much in the adjectives used for the descriptions but in the meanings imputed to the various characteristics. For instance, Mexican Americans were still described as "emotional" which formerly was a negative value in materialistic America but not it had a positive meaning. The Anglo-associated success characteristic "materialistic" had changed from being a positive trait to being negatively viewed as an "establishment" value, extricably connected with racism and expoitation of minority peoples (Dworkin, 1972:8-9).

The radical bent of Chicanismo flourishing during the Civil Rights era of the late 1960s was difficult for sympathetic Mexican American middle class families and older generations (accustomed to the "accommodating 1920s" or the "separatist 1940s" philosophies) to embrace, especially the activist methods and the overt glorification of lower class values.

> They sympathize with the goals of chicanismo, yet they fear that the radical means used to pursue these ends will undermine their own hard-earned social and economic gains...but for the older leaders to oppose the Chicano protest might be a slow form of personal political suicide as well as acting to exacerbate derisiveness in the Mexican American community (Cuellar, 1970:154).

In time, as some visible achievements resulted from the zeal of these youthful Chicanos, even the more conservative Mexican Americans openly proclaimed their support for La Causa (The Cause) and were less reticent to be generally subsumed under the "Chicano" label (CCCHE, 1969:77-80, 89-90) though there was considerable campus support from University students, the activism within Chicano Studies programs produced many internal strains (Rochin, 1972).

While militant tactics seemed to effectively promote ethnic pride,

at the same time these did not lead to visible gains in the social and economic welfare of the Mexican American minority. Briegel avers:

> Although the militants have yet to make a noticeable contribution to the economic or social situtation of the Mexican-American community, they have increased the greatest potential for change of any group of Mexican-American organizations (1970:178).

But this radical approach has not been solid "gains" without corresponding "costs". In adopting the confrontation tactics of radicalism (Venceremos, 1971), the militant factions of Chicanoism denied themselves access to the resources of the larger society for better housing, health facilities, and educational opportunities for barrio residents, even though their aim was to preserve the barrio (Calchihueta, 1971). Their unquestioned (and often unwise) support of New Left aims drew the ire of political, economic, legal and social institutions when the revolt of the middle America taxpayer became a backlash against unbridled destruction, questionable experimental self-determination programs, and "reverse racist" quotas in employment and higher education opportunities. But weilding these activist confrontation tactics in pursuit of a Mexican heritage they barely knew and even less understood, militant Chicanos inadvertantly destroyed some of the basic Mexican institutional patterns they were dedicated to protect. The deference to age, exemplified by patriarchal authority, was defied with impunity in their effort to break from past accommodation traditions of their fathers. The equality of males and females in the protest marches and confrontations ran counter to the traditional Mexican female image. Caught in the inconsistencies of low wages for Mexican Americans because of Mexican alien commuters or Wetbacks, they supported efforts to prevent Mexicans from undermining the work opportunities of Mexican Americans while at the same time declaring their brotherhood with all Mexicans. (URG, 1971:115). The reality of citizen Mexican Americans living as neighbors to resident Mexican aliens created serious differences of generational and national reference groups, resulting in friction and discord between them as reported by a housing relocation study in U.S. Mexico border city (Stoddard, 1970b:17-18).

There is continuous debate among ethnic leaders as to whether the "true Mexican heritage" espoused in the barrio is "Mexican" or simply an adulterated version of Anglo lower class values or that of the "culture of poverty." The question then becomes, which attributes are <u>ethnic</u> rather than social class differences and why is discrimination against middle class Spanish-speaking immigrants less than that directed toward Spanish-speaking persons in the lower class (Cf Portes, 1969). Casavantes complains that during this period of ethnic pride resurgence, Chicanos are not absolutely sure of what aspects of their ethnic heritage they should take pride in. He asks:

> How can we ask our children to be proud of being terribly poor?---... a false stereotype of Mexican American is represented by a description of the Mexican American as possessing only those attributes accurately associated with the lower-lower socio-economic class...
>
> Unless Mexican Americans <u>themselves</u> come to distinguish clearly between ethnicity and social class, a Mexican American youngster might well be ostracized by some peers when he tries to live the life of a middle-class Mexican. As matters stand now, far too often the feeling

is that any Mexican American individual who tries to be middle class in his style of life is "not a true Chicano." (1969:7-8)

Casavantes maintains that "to speak Spanish well, to enjoy Mexican music and Mexican food, to periodically recall the customs and ways of life of Spain and of Mexico--these are truly Chicano." (1969:7) Garza (1969) adds to these the emjoyment of traditional folklore of the past, Mexican American literature and movies depicting the past.

As national tolerance for extreme activism declined, the popularity of Chicano radicalism both in the barrio and on campus, declined abruptly. The more conservative wing of the Chicano Movement became interested in consolidating their past gains but with more moderation, less defensiveness against potential ridicule, and less extreme rejections against Anglo liaisons. They soon discovered that their tempered and restrained orientation had to surmount problems which were a carryover of the militant era. The abrasiveness of former arrogant "totalitarian-type" Chicano leaders against sympathetic middle class (Purple Tío Tomás) Mexican Americans and Anglo supporters had destroyed the broad resource base with which to maximize the new image of self-determination recently gained. New communication channels had to be built and very slowly their credibility was restored. Whereas at one time, ever more confining criteria were used to guage one's true Chicano standing (i.e., being Catholic, having a Spanish surname, Spanish-speaking, Chicano(a) spouse, Southwest ancestry, barrio residence,etc.), now a reverse trend has been noted in recent years. Being "Chicano" is currently determined more by one dedication to Mexican American betterment, even if not born of the bronze skinned, Spanish surnamed people of Mexican descent (. Rivera, 1972; Estrada, 1972).

Chicano activity has not disappeared entirely from the radical vector, but it is presently more concentrated in the process of penetrating the social institutions and success channels of the larger society (which were closing rapidly from extensive ethnic abuse and non-use during the revious confrontation phase). If self-determination may be maintained while receiving external aid, even Anglo resources are willingly accepted by most Chicano groups (a major exception being the Children of Aztlan who will be discussed later on.) But whatever direction self-identity takes from now on into the future, one thing is certain--Mexican Americans are determined to have the final say in its strategy and execution, and that is as it should be.

The Chicano Movement(s) would be strengthened markedly if barrio elements could overcome the temptation to regard middle class Mexican Americans (or campus-types) as cultural traitors, malinches.[26] Barrio leaders are not always willing to admit that effective power to influence and command in the larger society comes from organized, legitimized strength. For this, the Movement(s) must have leadership knowledgeable in the tactics of organization and power effective within the larger Anglo society. They cannot continue to declare educated ethnic people displaying these skills as ethnic deviants, and expect to receive the added advantage of their training, experience and knowledge of the workings of middle class WASP society. Identity and efficacy are the intranacine combatants and which is stressed to the exclusion of the other will determine whether Chicanismo

will survive in its presence mode or will be supplanted by a new ethnic identity model.

7) Hijos de Aztlan[27]

The Aztlan phenomenon is appropriately part of the Chicano Movement(s), but because of its rather unique and identifiable focus, it is treated as a separate identity image. It is a visionary and idealistic call to believers who would ally themselves with the mystical Aztec Philosophies. It is a dedication to their restoration and pride using for a guide the cosmology of what they believe to be a pre-Aztec people of ancient Aztlán. They see their destiny in a symbolic separation from Anglo society caretakers of the lands. This, then is the spiritual destiny of the bronze-skinned peoples of the Southwest.

A concept similar to that of contemporary Aztlán was traced by Rivera (1972) from the work of Vasconcelos who interpreted the land/people bond in a kind of "Messianic Hope." Among contemporary Chicanos leaders, the declarations of Tijerina linked the bronze-skinned people together and claimed that their destiny was tied to the regaining of their ancestral lands in the Southwest. His early prophetic announcements[28] called them to dedication, and he promised them that with unity and purpose, they would once more stand on their ancestral lands and there usher in the millenuim of Peace spoken of in Biblical texts. Though his words were similar, he did not refer to Aztlán explictly. It was for "Corky" Gonzales to bring forth the birth of Aztlán when in March, 1969, he addressed the Chicano Youth Liberation Conference in Denver. He soberly proclaimed the total separation of the people and lands of Aztlán from modern political or social boundaries and called his people "out of Babylon" with the following oath.

> In the spirit of a new people that is conscious not only of its proud historical heritage but also of the brutal "gringo" invasion of our territories, we, the Chicano inhabitants and civilizers of the northern land of Aztlan whence came our forefathers, reclaiming the land of their birth and consecrating the determination of our people of the sun, declare that the call of our blood is our power, our responsibility, and our inevitable destiny.

This pronouncement liberally combines elements of the quasi-racism of Vasconcelos' La Raza Cósmica, the identity tie to Indian ancestry, the "Anglo invasion" theory of the "1848 (Mexican)" image, and the emotional dedication to separatism and total replacement of Anglo society from radical Chicano elements. It symbolically integrates the glories of the ancient Toltec and Aztec empires with a mystical pre-emptive claim to the lands of the Southwest. Although the point of departure is his resentment toward Anglos who control this land (and its minority peoples), his main thrust is the need for and sincere dedication to present ethnic autonomy.

> We are free and sovereign to determine those tasks which are justly called for by our house, our land, the sweat of our brows, and our hearts. Aztlán belongs to those who plant the seeds, water the fields, and gather the crops, and not to the foreign Europeans, We do not recognize capricious frontiers on the Bronze Continent.

Spanish forbears as well as present national boundaries and territories are repudiated. The rejection of shame for possessing a darker skin is is replaced by a pride in "a bronze people with the bronze culture." Gonzales ended his Spiritual Plan of Aztlan with this awsome procl mation:

> We are a nation; we are a union of free pueblos; we are Aztlan!

In the circulated, printed version a subscript is added cautioning against becoming co-opted by Great Society programs or other Anglo liaisons.

> Por La Raza Todo. Fuera de a Raza Nada.[29]

This intoxicating, euphoric idea of ultimate destinies and the regaining of ancient glories has caused Aztlán writers to disregard the four intervening centuries of Spanish conquest and culture and to link their contemporary aspirations to that of the ancient Aztec culture and history as they claim it to be (Ortego, 1970; Rendón, 1971; Meier and Rivera, 1972). Of these, the most vivid outpouring of the spiritual mysticism of Aztlan is the Chicano Manifesto (Rendón, 1971), which in a brief summary covers the following aspects of Aztlán and its contemporary role. Beginning with a historical enumeration of the Aztec religion and its traditions as they are popularly conceived, he talks of the period of El Quinto Sol (the Fifth Sun) of Aztec mythology, explaining its modern application by individual Chicanos as follows:

> We Chicanos, the people of el Quinto Sol must realize Aztlán in ourselves, individually and as a group. We are part of the land, but we need not seek a geographic center for our Aztlán; it lies within ourselves, and it is boundless, immeasureable, and limited only by our lack of vision, but our lack of courage. We are Aztlán and Aztlán is us.

As Gonzales before him had declared "With our heart in our hands and our hands in the soil, we declare the independence of our Mestizo Nation", the call is to become an autonomous people with a destiny inextricably tied to 'the land" but without the necessity to attach it to a specific geographical site or to be limited within an arbitrary territorial boundary. Rendón goes beyond the mere territoriality of land, however, as he explains:

> Justice could be based solely on land, its products, its permanence, and its beauty. And there is another justice that depends not on legalities but on what we refer to as "la raza," a cultural entity rather than a purely racial sentiment. (1971:167).

The sociologist Rivera speaks of the concept of La Raza in the Aztlán context as a unique phenomenon to North American society, "an example of what Durkheim meant by collective representations...of the collective mind of peoples tied by history"(1972:10). It has the appeal of the Christian Crusades to retake "the Holy Land", the Islamic dedication to fight for the people of Allah, the Jewish "Chosen People" concepts, and the Messianic

Hope all combined into one.

K—As an emotional appeal, the Aztlán image is a powerful catalyst for throwing off external criteria of identity and for establishing a new self-image, a destiny rooted in the romantic mysticism of an ancient cosmology. Its emotional attraction and its charismatic leaders have few parallels in history. However, sooner or later it must come to grips with reality--both historically and in the contemporary world in which it now gestates. It is in this realm wherein Aztlan suffers its greatest potential danger--exposure of the "presumed authentic" cosmology upon which it is totally grounded, discovering that Quinto Sol is a fictional rather than a historical account. Likewise, contemporary scholars, though crediting the Aztecs with a phenomenonal hegemony, ecognizes many of their "original contributions" as the work of others.

In histories of the Ancient Empires of Central America and Mexico, much of the credit for the advanced cultural contributions formerly ascribed to the Aztec empire (although less than one century duration) has been subsequently identified through reputable archeological evidence as the work of pre-Aztec peoples.

> The Aztecs were inheritors of a sequence of brilliant Indian cultures that had risen, fallen, and disappeared, but had bequeathed to the Aztecs many of their skills, ideas and institutions. (Josephy, 1968:189-190)

A brief review of the 2,500 years history of Central Mexico and Central American major civilizations gives us some idea of this rich cultural legacy which was adopted by the newcomer Aztec peoples from the North.

Before 1,000 B.C. Central America was inhabited by nomadic hunter and gatherer peoples without defined territories. Early stable civilizations identified from sedentary archeological remains include the Olmecs (1200 B.C.-400 B.C.) and Monte Albán, located near present day Oaxaca (500 B.C.-300 A.D.).

During the early classical period the people of Teotihuacán (300-650 A.D.0 emerge and strangly disappear, leaving only the burned remains of their ceremonial center which today is mute evidence of an engineering technology far advanced over the cultures of their day. The late classical period which followed (600-900 A.D.) was dominated by the Toltecs, credited with the establishment of modern cities with stable agricultural sources nearby. Their capital, Tollan, located about 50 miles north of Mexico City was displaced from power by a Toltec remnant who established the City of Tula. By 1100 A.D. this dynasty had extended its influence back into the Yucatan peninsula and the ancient Olmec lands but in 1200 A.D. they were overrun by Chichimecs from the North who forced the inhabitants of Tula to abandon their spacious city. One of their most noted contributions was the legend left to posterity in the glorification of their last leader "in the mythical proportions of an aged and dying god, who promised to return, bringing wealth and peace to an afflicted people." He was Quetzalcoatl, One Reed, Our Prince" (León-Portilla, 1960: 9).

¶ The fall of Tula created a power void in the valley of Central Mexico and from its disintegrating centralism emerged many City-States which built up their local hegemonies by exacting tribute from their weaker neighbors. Into this anarchical cluster came a weak and relatively primitive Nahuatl-speaking tribe from the North, the Mexicas (later calling themselves the Aztecs--from Aztlán, the name of their northern homeland) who were forced to settle in the barren and marsh-filled islands on the Western side of Lake Texcoco. Easily subdued, they were a tribute-paying people to the Tepanecs[30] located in the city of Azcapolzalco on the far side of the lake who had only recently attained their power over their neighbors some sixty years previously (Josephy, 1968:211).

A century after the founding of the Aztec capital, Tenochtitlán, the Tepanec Lord Tezozomoc died and his son Maxtla, a bitter enemy of the Aztecs, came to the throne. The Aztec nobility had decided to submit to him as they had to his father, but a historically unsung hero, Tlacaelel, adviser to the Aztec King, redirected the course of the Mexica people. Drawing from Sagahun's[31] accounts written in original Hahuatl, León-Portilla (1960) documents the subsequent tactics strategically employed by the brilliant Tlacaelel.

Tlacaelel convinced the Aztec King, Itzcoatl, and the other Lords to throw off the yoke of tribute and subservience and to openly rebel. This they did successfully which resulted in their independence in 1427. From this point they began their assent to sovereignty over extensive political Empire. Through shrewd administrative alliances with other Nahua-speaking peoples and subsequent convincing military conquests, the Aztec leadership brought a loosely coordinated group of tribal democracies into a more centralized, stratified society (Cumberland, 1968:42) with themselves, an internally stratified society of few elites and many commoners, at the power apex. The Aztec elite were comprised of a military aristocracy, traditional city elders, corporate kinsmen groups and the Lordly class including the King. By expropriate land from their conquered enemies, these various groups flourished with the spoils of exploitation and military conquest.

Still unsatisfied with the rather mediocre and unspectacular background history of their people, the Aztec leadership under the advise of Tlacaelel, set out to create a new version of Aztec greatness. With great deliberation old records were burned and new ones rewritten in which their people, their state, and their leaders would play heroic parts. A legendary cosmology was created to portray a people of unequaled military exploits with a contrived destiny to match any McLuhanese image of contemporary annals. These points are made by Leon-Portilla, one of the foremost scholars on Aztec history and literature, who for many years was affiliated with Mexico's Indigenous Institute and has reported on the recently translated codices of Sahagun containing the written interviews with Aztec historians at the time of Conquest. The following documentary evidence is cited from the codices.

> A record of their history was kept. But then it was burned during the reign of Itzcoatl in Mexico. A resolution was taken; the Aztec chiefs said, it is not suitable that everyone should know the pictures. The people, our subjects, would be ruined and the earth would move crookedly...(León-Portilla, 1960:11)

This Aztec censorship of their own records allowed them to be replaced with the rewritten versions, more flattering to them. Although the purifying purge of Aztec religious and cultural symbols by the Spanish included the burning of many of these spurious accounts, these fictional histories survived to be romanticed in popular myths and legends surrounding the Aztec Empire, people and religion.

Among the Aztec elite were the ancients--wise men--many of whom deplored Tlacaelel's deceptions of history and the horrors of mass sacrifice perpetuated in the name of a fictional, contrived religion. These wished to return to the traditions of the Toltecs, but Tlacaelel overcame their objections. The new Aztec history contained an image of a glorious, magnificent past, including an affinal relationship to Toltec nobility. But the most enduring of all were the mystical creations concerning their Gods and their own ultimate destiny, as explained by León-Portilla.

> Their divinities, especially their patron, Huitzilopochtli, god of war, were raised to the same plane as the creative divinities of the various mythological ages or "suns." Above all, this new history exhalted the military spirit of the "people of the sun" whose mission was to subdue the nations of the earth...
>
> The traditional cosmology of the Nahuatl-speaking peoples gave this chauvinistic rhetoric a uniquely mystical resonance. According to tradition, the Aztecs were living during the fifth of a series of cosmics ages, or suns. And their age, like the ages that had preceded it, was to end in a cataclysm (1960:11).

Tlacaelel promoted the notion that Huitzilopochtli was the patron of the Fifth cosmic epoch,[32] and that only through providing him with abundant human sacrifices could the blood sacrifices begun by the Gods at Teotihuacán enable the human race to survive. Thus, the religious institution of blood sacrifice (revived from Olmec and Teotihuacan religions) was converted from a symbolic ritual to mass sacrifice of tribute peoples, an effective tool of political terrorism. This helped pave the way for these tribute peoples to openly support and assist Cortés and his men (whom they thought were "heaven sent" liberators" to help free themselves from the oppressive tyranny of their Aztec overlords.) Perhaps without the voluntary efforts of some of these subject peoples (less than two decades under the Aztec yoke),the Spanish conquest would not have been so successful. The military ambushes prepared against Cortés, and of which he was informed by helpful Indian sympathizers, were similarly unsuccessful because of tribute people's rebellion rather than to the superiority of Spanish military tactics and bravery as often supposed.

This, then, is a more accurate (albeit deflating) account of the Aztec glories--born of merciless expoitation over neighboring tribute peoples, which was in turn was exerted over them by mercenary Spanish conquistadores religious and a racist Monarchy.This reign was subsequently replaced by Mexican revolutionary leaders who kept the masses in subjection to a small elite class. Ultimately, the Anglo entrepeneurs in the West began the exploitation of the Southwest land (and indirectly its people) from the period of the Mexican War to the present. Thus it appears to be a consistent pattern of changing sovereignty which must be substituted for the mystique and attraction of the mythological, fictitious account of Aztec goodness

and its glorified cosmological destiny.

Beyond the problem arising from the mythological genesis of the Aztlán cosmology is that of the Aztlán movement facing the vicissitudes of the real world. Aztlán proclaims the doctrine of total-separation--one which is eventually self-defeating in the complex, technological world of today, as Moore suggests:

> Whatever the sentimental attractions of a completely separate community, such a community never has actually worked...But the romantic ideal of the separate community persists perhaps only because it is romantic, and simple (1970a:96).

The separate society exists within the raging power plays of nations, regions, legislative and judicial systems, and key decision-making organizations. To prevent encroachment by these, a minority representative must have the credentials to compete in the larger society. Many of these credentials (occupational skills, wealth, political savoir faire, charismatic attradtion, etc.) cannot be acquired totally within the separate community. Therefore, only those who have gained skills within the larger society and who later embraced the concept of Aztlán are effectively trained for battle with the larger society and its institutions.

The "Chicano Studies" major advances the indoctrination goals of Aztlán but is hard put to deal subsequently with employment opportunities and income. This is caused by a confusion with ideological concepts and the real world. For Aztlán purists, traditional college curricula are declared a "compromise" with Anglo dominated social system. A San Diego professor evaluating this dilemma, comments.

> Although the proponents of Aztlan suggest that such a compromise [following a traditional college discipline instead of a Chicano Studies major] is corrupt, they offer no solution to how one supports one's family. Thus, there is some question as to the literal or symbolic solidarity to be found in the concept of Aztlán (Kennedy, 1972:7).

Even rapid success creates dilemmas for an idealistic movement, in this case Aztlán. As the comforting emotional relationships within the small, cohesive and homogeneous cadre produces a greater and greater number of adherents, the social structure of the movement must be modified and redirected from a fealty (followers of charismatic leader) to a bureaucratic system. The latter, a system of impersonal relationships whose object is the maximization of organizational effectiveness, is an abrupt change from the psychic satisfactions found within the smaller cloistered group at the beginning. The movement develops "primary group withdrawal" symptoms and loyal followers, once attracted by the emotional intensity of the earlier movement, depart or become apathetic. As Tijerina before him, Gonzales will find it difficult to continue the high emotional pitch of Aztlán which rose majestically but crested in the late part of 1971 or early 1972.

In summary, although the symbols upon which Aztlán rests are fictional, its symbolic impact in producing a positive image among its Mexican

American adherents is very real and can be stated as the major accomplishment of it and all other segments of the Chicano movement. But it is dangerous to continue building an image on fiction and deceit, as the Anglo society is now learning.

The dedication shown by Aztlán believers in establishing their own positive identity reflects something about themselves as well as some insight into the larger society which they have rejected. For them, the elusive ideological world of symbolism is strategically a safe place for them to dream their dreams and envision future visions. As one writer insightfully explained.

> It so happens...that as a man becomes increasingly disadvantaged, he becomes increasingly dependent upon those things that are the least readily taken from him; the qualities of mind and spirit; the principles of personal integrity...And personal integrity, in all men, is to a considerable degree determined by parentage and class and racial background, and is particularly so determined among those who have for six centuries thought of themselves as la raza, THE race. (Gardner, 1970:201).

Although for the short run the Chicano Movement(s) thrives on anti-Anglo hatred as the source of its internal cohesion, this becomes a weak basis for a permanent positive self-image. If our analysis of history has taught us anything, it is the fact that the seeds of societal decay seen in pre-Aztec, Aztec, Spanish, and Mexican hegemonies were matured because of their inability to correctly perceive themselves. Once powerful, they were eventually placed in subjugation by succeeding dynasties. Hopefully some reality therapy by members of the Anglo and Aztlán societies will seek to establish new dominant and minority identities upon a more accurate view of history than possessed by these ancient peoples. Thus, the dominant group would no longer need to distort minority history for fear of losing its ascribed superiority, and the need for minority hatred toward the Anglo as the basis for a new and positive ethnic image will have been removed.

In summary, this essay has examined seven identity patterns ascribed to or claimed by members of the Mexican American minority. Each of these is based in a segment of history from which it traces its origin, but all suffer from being to a greater or lesser degree ahistorical. Each of these images promotes a distorted view of Mexican American homogeneity. Most of them, while showing a great deal of creative imagination, are either fictitious creations or symbols which are built apart from reality.

Mexican American identity is far more complex than these deceptively simple identity images would have us believe. In fact, it encompasses them all! It shows the rich variety of genetic and cultural fusion, forbears who were both imperialistic despots as well as humiliated and subjected people. The emergence of contemporary Mexican American culture and people might more correctly be seen as a sequential process of temporal periods in which each succeeding era is built upon the remaining institutions and social structures of the previous one. Now within the remainder of this essay we will discuss the Mexican American as a multi-cultural people, having evolved through a sequence of historical eras, and having experienced both superordinate and subordinate positions during this long period extending back into pre-history archeology.

Mexican American Identity - A Multi-Cultural Legacy

Conceptually, Mexican American identity is more than a mere symbol or event; it is a dynamic image emerging from a continuous process of human develop in which the genetic and cultural variations from European and indigenous peoples are combined within a complex historical evolution. But if there is a single continuous thread throughout this process, it is that the subordinate groups of the past, though initially powerless and dependent, in subsequent stages became more autonomous and independent. This is true of Mexican Americans in the Southwest today and their emergence as a more self-reliant and autonomous people.

Of the limited number of scholars who have identified Mexican American within an extensive historical framework, a sampling might include the work of Cabrera (1971), Chavarría (1970), Gomez-Quiñones (1971) and Stoddard (1973). While Cabrera's overview is well written and simple, it is purposefully superficial, lacking the documentation necessary as a foundation for further scholarly work. The brief outline offered by Chavarría is described as a most "innovative and seminal work in sketching a chronological framework, suggesting themes and signal events...most expressive of the views of the younger Chicano Historians" (Gómez-Quiñones, 1971:10). But here again, because of its sketchy outline and lack of detailed documentation, its utility is limited. However, its strength lies in its scope; thus, it does not suffer from the ahistorical criticism merited by most contemporary writers.

The work of Goméz-Quiñones (1971;1972) is superior to any other periodization analyst both in thoroughness, literature review, and accuracy. He examines Chicano history as a sequence of cumulative events rather than a single cataclysmic occurence. And he is aware of the socio-cultural contributions which have been made by writers during a specific temporal period as well as sources which have been written concerning a specific era. Utilizing a simple, convenient century-wise chronological calender with temporal sub-units, he has arranged the following periodization categories and their themes, beginning with 1600 and continuing to the present.

1600-1800 settlement and expansion
1800-1830 florescence and relative harmony, interethnic contact in SW
1830-1848 conflict--both legal and extra-legal
1848-1875 resistance to Anglo domination
1875-1900 subordination and marginalization--shift in land use demands new sub-culture; socio-political-economic relations emerge which subsequently govern the interrelations of Chicano-Anglo peoples
1900-1920 Emigration from Mexico, and Mexican American urbanization in the Southwest
1920-1941 Intense repression; economic deprivation of the Depression
1941-1945 A break in Caste status; the "pachuco" phenomenon
1945-1965 Chicano community participated on terms of the larger society
1965-present La Reconquista-the Movement demanding cultural pluralism and self determination

Not too unlike the above schema, Stoddard (1973) has described a series of temporal eras within which superordinate-subordinate relationships of the various cultural collectivities are analyzed. Unlike the century by century approach of Gómez-Quiñones, however, these eras reflect major shifts in Mexican American identity orientations as related to critical epochal occurrences. Within each era are outlined in some detail the different identity processes and trends occurring within the various social class levels, between generations involved, and between cultural groups in the different geographical regions involved which make their historical legacy so complex and heterogeneous. The five major sequential temporal eras of Stoddard are:

I. Eras of Conquest and Colonization (1519-1909)
II. Era of Cultural Accommodation (1910-1941)
III. Era of Ethnic Separatism (1942-1962)
IV. Era of Ethnic Autonomy and Radicalism (1963-1969)
V. Era of Strategic Penetration (1970-present)

Because much of the detailed material describing each of these eras has been cited previously throughout this essay to clarify and discuss these monistic identity images, a simple summary of each Era will suffice to show the processual nature of Mexican American identity evolvement.

The early conquest years in America, beginning centuries before Christ, revealed sequential Olmec, Toltec, and Aztec dynasties subsequently replaced by the Spanish Empire. All of the subordinate peoples under each of these hegemonies were very dependent and without recourse to any means of self-determinism. During the Spanish colonial years, this domination continued. However, it was now reinforced through racist practices of social and Church status heirarchies instead of the former tactics of military force.

The advent of Mexican Independence merely changed the faction controlling this "pigmentocracy" from the previous Old World elite to the New World elite. Slowly the sanctioning mechanisms for maintaining the traditional stratification system shifted from social castes and Church domination to that of economic servitude of the masses to the small elitist group. This situation prevailed at the time of the Cession by Mexico of the Southwest Territory in 1848.

Within the Southwest, Anglo American developments advanced relatively slowly until after the Civil War period. Following that holocaust, military forces were sent to the West to effect the final "removal" of recalcitrant Indian groups or, failing that, to liquidate them as a menace to settlers and transportation routes. Anglo representatives of Eastern interests commenced to acquire and exploit the land and its natural resources. Mining agriculture and cattle enterprises were launched. Following the 1870-1880 decades of railroad building throughout the Southwest, these enterprises expanded rapidly and the exploitation of natural resources for far-away markets (incidentally, leading to indirect and direct exploitation of indigenous or immigrant peoples) began on a large scale.

The 200,000 Mexican Americans in the United States southwest in 1900 had neglible impact on the events of that period. As the Mexican Revolution

of 1910 erupted, waves of Mexican immigrants came into the United States, accounting for the largest number of immigrants in any single decade in history. The advent of World War I brought about the "accommodation years" when many European immigrant minorities within the United States attempted to assimilate into American society as equals, and numerous Mexican Americans followed that trend. They rejected their former Mexican culture and Spanish language, and adopted an American middle class life style as their core values. Some Mexican Americans made successful adjustments to and were accepted by Anglos of equal social status. But for the masses of unskilled, uneducated Mexican aliens and native citizens of Mexican descent, the extreme privation and hardships of the Depression years demanded a constant fight for physical survival. Many were returned to Mexico forceably; many other returned voluntarily. Of the families that survived the Depression years in the United States have come the majority of today's urban Mexican American residents of the Southwest.

Accompanying the industrialization and urbanization trends of the World War II period, Mexican Americans became an urban minority, with increasing economic and educational opportunities. Many of them entered the Armed Services and upon returning to their home towns following the War, refused to accept the former second-class citizenship statuses afforded them under the old ethnic imagry. They organized independent ethnic social institutions duplicating those of the larger society, thereby adopting a posture of "cultural separatism". Mexican Americans were now both leaders and followers, not just followers as they were formerly in Anglo-dominated systems. Though these organizations were not as powerful or socially as prestigious as those of the Anglo, they were the beginning of self-determinism and pride in their ethnic culture.

The Civil Rights movement during the late 1950s was contagious. These events precipitated the use of the successful Black Power model by Mexican American radical elements, and the confrontation tactics of militant Chicano groups began an era of increased "ethnic autonomy". This approach differed from the previous "cultural separatism" in that this latter movement saw the necessity to destroy the racist institutions of Anglo society before the Mexican American minority could fully develop its potential. This orientation flourished, but with a backlash shift against extreme radicalism throughout America in the latter part of 1969, the successes previously gained through a radical stance of Chicanismo waned also.

The current era, "strategic penetration" seeks to penetrate existing professions and institutions by means of opening up or increasing opportunities to enter the success channels of the larger society. With current policies of government, business, and judicial systems no longer giving overbalanced quotas to minorities, these channels are slowly being closed to powerless minorities once again. If strategic penetration does not show visible results another era of radicalism may be now in the germination stages.

The periodization of Gómez-Quiñones and Stoddard, though not totally synchronized, have a great more in common than in their differences. Both attempt to see emerging trends of one era leading to the next. Perhaps the single most noticeable difference is the Stoddard absence of an epoch commencing the symbolic transfer of land following the War with Mexico.

Another variation, reflecting perhaps his external observation locus, is his explicit termination of the militant Chicano era as the dominant trend of Mexican American identity today. Indeed, even these differences are only tentative awaiting further scholarship to document their validity or lack of it.

With whatever measure of accuracy these periodization approaches capture the dominant trends as they accumulate from the past, it is a beginning; dedicated to "tell it like it is, and like it was" in regard to "Chicano history." By knowing the past with increased accuracy, it is far easier to identify those factors responsible for creating the false images and stereotypes of the past, and thus be more effective in modifying them.

The goal of identity clarification is to allow the Mexican American greater freedom from the stigma associated with distorted history. Only then is he free to select whatever occupation he chooses, formulate his own future goals if he chooses, and to have a greater control over his own destiny if he so chooses. At least we are sure that ignorance and hatred, discrimination and reprisal, racism and reverse racism all produce a distorted play, an epic novel with a confused plot in which the players are not sure which are their "dramatic" roles and which are their own true identity. Minorities must have equal chance at the star roles, not be totally confined to the subordinate ones, for,

> If a social system is defective in role casting, it becomes like a play in which most of the actors are dissatisfied with their parts; or, worse, extras standing around with no parts at all. If a social system is inadequate in feedback and symbolization, it cannot give individuals an adequate means of meaning-- of others, or of themselves (Klapp, 1969:14).

This recent decade has shown us that the larger society cannot long endure a drama exclusively Anglo in which all non-Anglo participants are angrily trying to destroy the set, the script and the production. Moreover, when those who are dissatisfied with their parts do not participate in the play, the entire production suffers. Those without parts must either substitute themselves forcibly in place of existing players or seek another location and produce their own. None of these alternatives appear to be beneficial to the dominant group and they do not seem to be the best solution for the minority group either, unless no others are available.

This essay concludes that the Mexican American identity crisis did not commence with contemporary Chicanismo, nor with the advents of the Mexican War for Independence, the Mexican American War, or the rapid changes accompanying World War I and World War II. It is a timeless evolutionary process, described by the author-director of El Teatro Campesino, Luis Miguel Valdez, in this way.

> It is not enough to say we suffer an identity crisis, because that crisis has been our way of life for the last five centuries! (Steiner, 1970:327)

After much documentary evidence assembled and interpreted within the complex periodization schemata constructed, the conclusions of this essay appear to be remarkably similar to those comments of Valdez! Perhaps, yet, there is some measure of agreement between scientific analyses regarding the Mexican American and the insights proclaimed by ethnic group members.

FOOTNOTES

1- The dominant theme of this essay is that Americans of Spanish or Mexican descent are a heterogeneous people. Yet, for analytical purposes, some overall label must be applied to this category collectively. The arbitrary selection was the most common term in use, Mexican American.

2- A minority need not be numerically deficient to be classified as such. Those ethnic segments of American society which lack equal political, economic or social power live in a "minority" position (Cf Penalosa,1970:6)

3- "Wetback" is derived from Mexican aliens who theoretically might wade the Rio Grande to illegally enter the United States. In actuality, during all but one or two summer months, this riverbed is absolutely dry from El Paso southward for more than 100 miles. To label Mexican Americans as "wetbacks" is to cast doubt upon their citizenry and to impute "foreign-ness."

4- Mexican Americans have argued over whether this term should have a hyphen, or whether adding one makes them less than full American. Cabrera (1971:67) uses it purposefully to symbolize the unfinished job of giving the Mexican American equality within American society. John Dewey argued that hyphenation was a "connecting" link of societies within the "melting pot"(Gordon,1964:139). Inasmuch as the "melting pot" has been shown to be a myth, it is obvious that such lofty philosophy is more rationalization than reality.

5- For more detailed descrptions of ethnic organizations, especially contemporary ones, see Gonzalez (1969:Chapters 5,8); Briegel (1970; Tirado (1970) and Stoddard (1973: Chapter 7). Also, refer to footnote 25 and Chicano leaders.

6- The early colonists were not united in their choice of an official language for the new nation. Hatred for the British made English only slightly more popular than other European languages considered. Also, this argument could be applied to early American colonists who did not bother to learn Arawak or Shawnee, the official languages of those territories, and "should have gone back to where they came from" ifthey didn't like the Indian dialects. It is from recent critical examination of our own Anglo society that we have discovered that we have become a society of "monoglots"--limited to conversations in a single language, and we fear those who are not bound by such restrictions.

7- Vaca's own explanation for this unusual item is:

> Since all Mexican-American values described by sociologists and anthropologists have opposite counterparts in the Anglo culture, I have listed those given by the authors discussed in this paper. However, throughout the literature on the Mexican American there is always reference to the Mexican-American value of Machismo but there is never cited an Anglo counterpart. I have taken the liberty of formulating my own counterpart"

which he then terms effeminacy. (1970b:45)

8- When Mexican Americans are described as having initiative and being interested in bettering their conditions, this view is so at variance with existing stereotypes as to be rejected by many functionaries in the larger society. In a recent OEO project in Arizona, the project was attempting to produce changes in

8-(Con'd)
health and housing conditions. When it became apparent that a high rate of barrio interest, participation, and project initiative existed, Anglo officials refused to accept these as spawned by local residents, insisting instead that the participation and activism was the result of "outside agitators" and "behind-the-scene manipulators." Local probation officers remained convinced that the barrio culture was the causal factor contributing to high rates of juvenile delinquency among Mexican-American youth. Likewise, local educators and religious leaders wanted so to believe that Mexican Americans were a childlike,dependent people that they continued to believe it even when confronted with evidence to the contrary.(Spicer, 1970:16; See also, Scott,1970: 13; Morin, 1966:23)

9- The dangers of the "folk culture" label can be seen by comparing the images attributed to the Mexican Americans by Kiev (1968) with folk healers and medical superstitions with realistic field studies of McLemore (1963) or Nall and Spielberg (1967), or to read the caustic criticisms of scholarly Mexican Americans toward these "health images" built upon "folk culture" stereotypes (Boucher, 1970).

10-Nogueria (1959) suggests that in New Spain racial designations were by mark (i.e. physical appearance) whereas in the United States prejudice is based upon origin (i.e. genealogical lineage.)

11-The cult of the Plumed Serpent was known by many cultures under different names. His Mayan name was Kulkulkán and by Aztecs known as Quetzalcoatl. (León-Portilla, 1960; Gibson, 1966)

12-Columbus described these new "Indians" he discovered as follows:

> So tractable, so peaceable, are these people that I swear to your Majesties there is not in the world a better nation. They love their neighbors as themselves, and their discourse is ever so sweet and gentle, and accompanied with a smile; and though it is true that they are naked, yet their manners are decorous and praiseworthy (Brown,1971:1).

Similar reports received by other New World emissaries declared that Indians encountered were "innocent, childlike persons spending their time in dancing and equally pleasurable pursuits."(Josephy, 1968:5) Early Portuguese Explorers in Labrador found the indigenous inhabitants curious, hospitable, and helpful (Collier, 1947:112). From this image of carefree simplicity sprang Jean Jacques Rousseau's vision of the "natural man", a rejection of civilization for the unharried life of the noble savage--a perpetuation of these early inaccurate stereotypes. These same images are used contemporarily among activists who "demand" that Indians be allowed to return to their original simplistic life.

13- On the island of Hispanola, the unsatiated desire for gold by the Spaniards drove them to "use up" the local Indian population until only a mere fraction of the former labor supply was available (Collier, 1947:112). They then imported the first Black slaves to the Americas, whose descendants today form the only Black Republic (Haiti) in the Americas.

14-The encomienda designated a given geographical region which was "commended" to an elite Spaniard. In return for services rendered by its inhabitants, they were furnished protection, Christianization, and contact with a superior patron. The repartimiento forced individuals (Indians) to perform services for the public good (often "public mines"(Spanish owned) or military service.) These institutions were known and practiced among indigenous peoples in America prior to the Spanish conquest (Cumberland, 1968:65)

15- Debt peonage was the practice of extending financial assistance to a potential servant who, thereafter, could never pay back the original debt (with accrued interest). It was not uncommon to have the descendants of original debtors in bondage for the debts of their forefathers. Though discontinued many times through formal decree, it continued tobe practiced informally well into the Twentieth Century in some isolated sections of Mexico.

16- Instances of Indian genocide are common as reported proudly by early Spanish Explorers in their own journals. For instance, De Soto killed an entire village of Indians whose relatives were currently assisting him, in order to "make the Indians stand in terror of the Spaniards" (Collier, 1947:113). Many more were killed during military engagements. But the greatest killer of them all was disease, toward which Indians had little natural immunity. Almost three million died from a misterious matlazahuatl (possibly influenza or typhus) in just two epidemics in 1545 and 1576. Smallpox and measles also took their tolls often wiping out entire communities (Cumberland, 1968:50-51)

17- Benito Juárez was known principally for his successful military campaign against the Emperor Maximillian and for his efforts to separate Church privileges from State responsibilities. He conducted programs energetically to a culturate Indians into Mexican society and sent military forces to subdue hostile tribes wishing to retain their own identity, culture and language. Thus, though he is sometimes held up as a symbol of cultural pluralism he was an all-out advocate of assimilation, by force if necessary.

18- Whether by coincidence or not, following the 1946 discovery of the "bones of Cortés", two years later the "bones of Cuauhtemoc" were reported found in Guerrero. A year later, much to the chagrin of the zealous indigenists, the find was "unauthenticated"(Gibson, 1966:46-47

19- Morris Swadesh estimates that 2,200 different Indian languages were being spoken in the New World at the time the Spanish arrived (Josephy,1971:12). Collier (1947:100-101) maintains that 100 different Indian societies existed in North America alone. Deloria, a contemporary Indian spokesman, explains that there are 315 Indian tribal groups scattered throughout 26 states still functioning as quasi-sovereign nations under treaty status, and about one-half million Indians are in cities--principally San Francisco, Los Angeles, Minneapolis and Chicago (Josephy, 1971:236)

20- These include Thomas Banyacya (Hopi), Mad Bear Anderson (Tuscarora), Clifton Hills (Creek) and Rolling Thunder (Shoshone).

21- Until 1948, Indians in Arizona and New Mexico were refused the right to vote in state elections even though Congress extended Indian sufferage in federal elections back in 1924 (Hagan, 1961:159)

22- Compared to modern giant-sized military units, the Spanish garrisons were very small. Gibson (1966:192) describes a typical outpost as usually staffed with about sixty soldiers, their families, Indian servants and a miscellany of hangers-on. Three or four such population concentrations throughout the state of Texas does not constitute much "control."

23- A designation given to Spanish surnamed persons working for the Independence of Texas as differentiated from Texans, a name reserved for Anglos (I.T.C., 1971; See also Almaráz, 1969 for a similar view.)

24- Gómez-Quiñones (1971) and Stoddard (1973) are discussed in the last section of this essay. Many authors have limited their periodization to the Twentieth Century such as Galarza, Gallegos and Samora (1969), Cuellar (1970), and many others. The major criticisms (Álvarez, 1971; Chavarría, 1971; Rocco,1971) directed against the monumental volume The Mexican-American People by Grebler and associates (1970) was that their periodization (1970:61-81) was ahistorical for a near-definitive work on this ethnic minority.

25- Some detailed accounts of contemporary Chicano heroes (given alphabetically) are: Chavez- Nelson (1966); Dunne (1967); Matthiessen (1969); Gonzales- Gonzales (1964); Steiner (1960:378-392); Guttierez- Miller and Preston (1971); Shockley (1972); David Sanchez- Torgerson (1968; Tijerina- Swadesh (1968;1969; Nabokov (1969); Love (1969); Gardner (1970); Luis Valdez- Steiner (1970:324-338).

26- Malinche was the mistress of Cortés. Thus, all who "prostitute" their culture are regarded as malinches.

27- Translated it means "Children of Aztlán" or descendants of the people who came from the land of Aztlan. It is an idealistic and visionary connection not held valid even by leading Chicano expressionists. Luis Valdez remarked: "It's kind of foolish, How can I have a memory of the Aztecs, of Mexico? Its impossible because I was born in Delano."(Steiner, 1970:334)

28- Although Tijerina's movement in northern New Mexico began as a nativistic appeal, an extension of his former religious crusades (Swadesh,1968) he later shifted his thrust to the Civil Rights Movement (Love, 1969). It is very necessary to know when his declarations were made to determine which context to interpret them.

29- Translation into English might be--"For La Raza [give your] all; Outside La Raza [contribute] nothing."

30-The Tepanecs were reputed to be descendants of the Teotihuacán civilization whose religious rituals included blood sacrifice. Thus, the Aztecs incorporated this into their "religion" and used it well during their era of sovereignty.

31- Sahagún, a Friar of New Spain during the early Conquest period, was a staunch supporter of Indian rights. For more than three decades he studied and wrote in the Nahuatl language and assiduously collected through direct informants the history of the Aztec people, This is published in his Informantes Indígenas de Sahagún, Matritense de la Real Academia de la Historia, from whence came the basic documentation for León-Portilla's books and articles concerning the Aztec culture and people.

32-The concept of "the struggle"(La Lucha) did not commence in the California vineyards. It was outlined in the spurious Aztec códices. The four aspects preceding the Fifth Sun(Quinto Sol)are: The revolt of a persecuted people, the cosmic struggle of the God ofthe Sun in constant conflict with the forces of night, the ideological struggle (with the creation of the new fictitious history) and the military struggle to retain their supremacy among their tribute subjects (León-Portilla, 1960:12)

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Aguirre Beltrán, Gonzalo
1946 La Población negra de México, 1519-1810: Estudio etnohistórico México

1953 Teoría y Práctica de la Educación Indígena. México, D.F.: Instituto Nacional Indigenista

Alba, Victor
1967 The Mexicans: The Making of a Nation. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger

Almaráz, Felix D. Jr.
1969 "The Historical Heritage of the Mexican in 19th Century Texas, an Interpretation" pp. 12-28 in The Role of the Mexican American in the History of the Southwest. Edinburg: Inter-American Institute, Pan American College

Álvarez, Rodolfo
1971 "The Unique Psycho-Historical Experience of the Mexican-American People" Social Science Quarterly 52 (June) : 15-29

Anastasi, Anne
1950 "Major Group Differences" pp. 375-390 in J.P. Guilford (ed) Fields in Psychology, New York: D. Van Nostrand (2nd ed)

Arciniega, Tom
1971 The Urban Mexican American: A sociocultural Profile. Las Gruces, ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural and Small Schools, New Mexico State University

Barrett, Donald N.
1966 "Demographic Characteristics" in Julian Samora (ed) La Raza: Forgotten Americans. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press

Beals, Ralph L.
1955 "Indian-Mestizo-White Relations in Spanish America" pp. 412-432 in Andrew Lind (ed) Race Relations in World Perspective, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. Reprinted in Melvin M. Tumin (ed) Comparative Perspectives on Race Relations. Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1969, pp. 239-257.

Blatt, Gloria T.
1968 "The Mexican American in Children's Literature" Elementary English (April 19) : 446-451

Bogue, Donald J.
1959 The Population of the United States. Glencoe: The Free Press

Borah, Woodrow
1951 New Spain's Century of Depression. Folcroft,Pa.:Folcroft Press

Borup, Jerry and Floyd Elliot
1969 "Relationship between Social Class and Mexican-American and Anglo-American Background as Variables Contributing to Attitudinal and Behavioral Pattern Differences of University Students." Paper presented at Rocky Mountain Social Science Association, Lubbock (May)

Boucher, Stanley W. (ed)
1970 Mexican-American Mental Health Issues: Present Realities and Future Strategies. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Briegel, Kay
1970 "The Development of Mexican-American Organizations", pp. 160-178 in Manuel P. Servín (ed) The Mexican-Americans: An Awakening Minority. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1970

Brooks, Charlotte K.
1968 "Some Approaches to Teaching English as a Second Language" pp. 515-523 in Staten W. Webster (ed) Educating the Disadvantaged Learner: III. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company

Broom, Leonard and Eshref Shevky
1952 "Mexicans in the United States: A Problem in Social Differentiation" Sociology and Social Research 36 (January-February) : 150-158

Brown, Dee
1971 Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West. New York: Bantam Books, Inc.

Browning, Harley L. and S. Dale McLemore
1964 A Statistical Profile of the Spanish-Surname Population of Texas. Austin: Bureau of Business Research, The University of Texas

Brussell, Charles W.
1968 Disadvantaged Mexican American Children and Early Educational Experience. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

Burma, John H.
1954 Spanish-Speaking Groups in the United States. Durham: Duke University Press

Bustamante, Jorge A.
1972 "The 'Wetback" as Deviant: An Application of Labeling Theory" American Journal of Sociology 77 (January) : 706-718

CCCHE (Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education)
1969 El Plan de Santa Barbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education. Oakland: La Causa Publications

C. R. D.
1971 "Civil Rights and Education for the Spanish speaking" Civil Rights Digest 4 (December) : 11-16

Cabrera, Y. Arturo
1971 Emerging Faces: The Mexican-Americans. Dubuque: William C. Brown

Calchihueta
1971 "Control of the Barrio Means Survival of the Barrio" Machete 5 (April 2) : 6-7

Casavantes, Edward J.
1969 A New Look at the Attributes of the Mexican-American. Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc.

Chandler, Charles R. and Kern Ewing
1971 "Urbanization and Value Change among Anglo and Mexican Americans" Paper presented at Southwestern Social Science Association. Dallas (March)

Chavarría, Jesus
1970 "A Precís and a Tentative Bibliography on Chicano History" Aztlán 1 (Spring) : 133-141

1971 "Professor Grebler's Book: The Magnum Opus of a Dying Era of Scholarship" Social Science Quarterly 52 (June) : 11-14

Clark, Margaret
1959 Health in the Mexican-American Culture: A Community Study. Berkeley: University of California Press

Cline, Howard F.
1963 Mexico: Revolution to Evolution: 1940-1960. New York: Oxford University Press

Collier, John
1947 Indians of the Americas: The Long Hope. New York: New American Library (Mentor edit.)

Commager, Henry Steele
1969 "The Americanization of History" Saturday Review (November 1) : 24-25, 54

Córdova, Ignacio R.
1969 The Relationship of Acculturation, Achievement, and Alienation among Spanish American Sixth Grade Students. Las Cruces, ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural and Small Schools, New Mexico State University

Cuellar, Alfredo
1970 "Perspective on Politics" pp. 137-160 in Joan W. Moore, Mexican Americans. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall

Cumberland, Charles C.
1968 Mexico: The Struggle for Modernity. New York: Oxford University Press

Dollard, John
1937 Caste and Class in a Southern Town. New Haven: Yale University Press

Dotson, Floyd
1955 "Disminución de la Población Mexicana en los Estados Unidos de Acuerdo con el Censo de 1950" Revista Mexicana de Sociología 17 : 151-160

Drake, St. Clair and Horace R. Cayton
1945 Black Metropolis. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company

Dunne, John Gregory
1967 Delano. New York: Farrer

Dworkin, Anthony Gary
1972 "Imagery in Aztlán: Chicano and Anglo Stereotypy" Paper presented at Southwestern Sociological Association, San Antonio (March)

Edmonson, Munro S.
1957 Los Manitos: A Study of Institutional Values. New Orleans: Tulane University Press

Estrada, Leobardo F.
1972 "Sociology, Social Movements, and the Chicano Sociologist" Paper presented at Southwestern Sociological Association, San Antonio (March)

Fogel, Walter
1965 Education and Income of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. Los Angeles: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles. Mexican American Study Project, Advance Report No. 1

Forbes, Jack D.
1968 "Race and Color in Mexican-American Problems" Journal of Human Relations 16 (no. 1) : 55-68

Foster, George M.
1953 "What is Folk Culture" American Anthropologist 55 (2) : 159-173

Freyre, Gilberto
1946 The Masters and the Slaves: A Study in the Development of Brazilian Civilization. New York: Alfred A. Knopf

Gaines, John S.
1972 "Treatment of Mexican American History in High School Textbooks" Civil Rights Digest 5 (October) : 35-40

Galarza, Ernesto, Herman Gallegos and Julian Samora
1969 Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. Santa Barbara: McNally and Loftin

Gamio, Manuel
1930 Mexican Immigration to the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

García, Angela B. and Roger I. Yoshino
1969 "The Mexican-American Family and Intellectual Achievement" Paper presented at American Sociological Association. San Francisco (September)

García, John
1972 "I.Q.: The Conspiracy" Psychology Today 6 (September) : 40-43, 93-94

Gardner, Richard
1970 ¡Grito! Reies Tijerina and the New Mexico Land Grant War of 1967. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company

Garreston, O. K.
1928 "A Study of Causes of Retardation Among Mexican School Children in A Small Public School System in Arizona" Journal of Educational Psychology 19 (January) : 31-40

Garth, Thomas R.
1923 "A Comparison of the Intelligence of Mexican and Mixed and Full Blooded Indian Children" Psychological Review 30: 388-401

Garza, Roberto J.
1969 "Culture Contributions of the Mexican-American" pp. 53-60 in the Role of the Mexican American in the History of the Southwest. Edinburg: Inter-American Institute, Pan American College

Gibson, Charles
1966 Spain in America. New York: Harper and Row

Gill, Lois and Bernard Spilka
1962 "Some Nonintellectual Correlates of Academic Achievement among Mexican-American Secondary School Students" Journal of Educational Psychology 53 (No. 3) : 144-149

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan
1963 Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews Italians and Irish of New York City. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press

Glenn, Norval D.
1971 "Some Reflections on a Landmark Publication and the Literature on Mexican Americans" Social Science Quarterly 52 (June) : 8-10

Gómez-Quiñones, Juan
1970 "Research Notes on the Twentieth Century: Notes on Periodization 1900-1965" Aztlán 1 (Spring) : 115-118

1971 "Toward a Perspective on Chicano History" Aztlán 2 (Fall) : 1-49

Gonzales, Rodolfo
1964 I Am Joaquin. Denver: Crusade for Justice

Gonzalez, Nancie L.
1969 The Spanish Americans of New Mexico: A Heritage of Pride. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press

Gordon, Milton M.
1964 Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins. New York: Oxford University Press

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman
1970 The Mexican-American People. New York: The Free Press

Guzmán, Ralph
1967 "Ethics in Federally Subsidized Research: The Case of the Mexican American" pp. 245-249 in The Mexican American: A New Focus on Opportunity. Washington, D. C.: Inter-Agency on Mexican American Affairs

Haddox, John
1970 Los Chicanos: An Awakening People. El Paso: Texas Western Press, The University of Texas at El Paso, Southwestern Studies No. 28.

Hagan, William T.
1961 American Indians. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Handlin, Oscar and Mary F. Handlin
1959 Danger in Discord: Origins of Anti-Semitism in the United States. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Hayner, Norman S.
1966 New Patterns in Old Mexico: A Study of Town and Metropolis. New Haven: College and University Press

Heller, Celia S.
1966 Mexican-American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York: Random House

Hewes, Gordon W.
1954 "Mexicans in Search of the 'Mexican': Notes on Mexican National Character Studies" American Journal of Economics and Sociology 18 (January) : 209-223

Higham, John
1970 Strangers in the Land. New York: Atheneum Press

Hoetink, H.
1967 The Two Variants in Caribbean Race Relations: A Contribution to the Sociology of Segmented Societies. New York: Oxford University Press

I.T.C.
1971 The Texians and the Texans: The Mexican Texans. San Antonio: University of Texas Institute of Texas Cultures

Johansen, Sigurd
1941 Rural Social Organization in a Spanish-American Culture Area. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin

Jones, Lee
1970 "Inexcusable Bias Found in History Textbooks" El Paso Times (April 9) : 2C

Josephy, Alvin M. Jr.
1968 The Indian Heritage of America. New York: Bantam Books
1971 Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom. New York: McGraw-Hill

Kennedy, Will C.
1972 "The Role of Ideology in the Mexican-American Studies Programs of the California State College System" Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association Meetings, San Antonio (March)

Kiev, Ari
1968 Curanderismo: Mexican-American Folk Psychiatry. New York The Free Press

Klapp, Orrin E.
1969 Collective Search for Identity. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

Kluckhohn, Florence Rockwood and Fred L. Strodtbeck
1961 Variations in Value Orientations. New York: Row, Peterson & Co.

Kranyik, Robert D.
1965 A Comparison of the Images of Mexico Portrayed in Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Possessed by Connecticut and Mexican Teachers. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut

Kuvlesky, William P., David E. Wright and Rumaldo Z. Juarez
1971 "Status Projectives and Ethnicity: A Comparison of Mexican American, Negro and Anglo Youth" Journal of Vocational Behavior 1 (April) : 137-151

Lara-Braud, J.
1970 "E Pluribus Unum: La Raza: pp. 9-14 in With All Due Respect. Austin, Texas: Southwest Intergroup Relations Council, Inc.

Leeds, Anthony
1968 "The Anthropology of Cities: Some Methodological Issues" Austin: Institute of Latin American Studies, Offprint Series No. 80

Leonard, O. E
1943 The Role of the Land Grant in the Social Organization and Social Processes of a Spanish-American Village in New Mexico. Ann Arbor: Edward Brothers

León-Portilla, Miguel
1960 "The Concept of the State among the Ancient Aztecs" Alpha Kappa Deltan 30 (Winter): 7-13

Lewis, Oscar
1951 Tepoztlán Restudied: Life in a Mexican Village. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Lieberson, Stanley
1961 "A Societal Theory of Race and Ethnic Relations" American Sociological Review 26 (December) : 902-910

Lopreato, Joseph
1970 Italian Americans. New York: Random House

Love, Joseph L.
1969 "La Raza: Mexican Americans in Rebellion" Trans Action 6 (February) : 35-41

Madsen, William
1964 The Mexican-Americans of South Texas. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Marcus, Lloyd
1961 The Treatment of Minorities in Secondary School Textbooks: Conclusions. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Matthiessen, Peter
1969 Sal si Puedes: César Chavez and the New American Revolution. New York: Random House

McLemore, S. Dale
1963 "Ethnic Attitudes toward Hospitalization: An Illustrative Comparison of Anglos and Mexican Americans" Southwestern Social Science Quarterly 43 (March) : 341-346

McWilliams, Carey
1933 "Getting Rid of the Mexican" The American Mercury (March) quoted in Leo Grebler, Mexican Immigration to the United States: The Record and Its Implications. Los Angeles: Mexican-American Study Project, Advance Report No. 2 (1966) : 26

1939 Factories in the Field: The Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California. Boston: Little, Brown and Company

1943 Brothers Under the Skin. Boston: Little, Brown and Company

1969 North from Mexico: The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States. New York: Greenwood Press

Mead, Margaret
1955 "The Spanish Americans of New Mexico, U.S.A." pp. 151-177 in Margaret Mead (ed) Cultural Patterns and Technological Change. UNESCO: Mentor Ed.

Meier, Matthew S. and Feliciano Rivera
1972 The Chicanos: A History of Mexican Americans. New York: Hill and Wang

Meinig, D. W.
1971 Southwest: Three Peoples in Geographical Change 1600-1970. New York: Oxford University Press

Menninger, Karl
1970 Number Words and Number Symbols: A Cultural History of Numbers. Cambridge: The MIT Press

Mercer, Jane R.
1972 "I.Q.: The Lethal Label" Psychology Today (September) : 44-47, 95-97

Miller, Herman P.
1964 Rich Man - Poor Man. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell

Miller, Michael V. and James D. Preston
1971 "Political Conflict in a Bifurcated Community: Anglo-Chicano Relations in a Small Texas Town" Paper read at the Southwestern Sociological Association, Dallas: (March)

Montez, Phillip
1970 "Will the Real Mexican American Please Stand Up?" Civil Rights Digest 3 (Winter) : 28-31

Moore, Joan W.
1970a Mexican Americans. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall

1970b "Colonialism: The Case of the Mexican Americans" Social Problems 17 (Spring) : 463-472

Moquin, Wayne (ed)
1971 A Documentary History of the Mexican Americans. New York: Praeger

1971a "The Last Reconquest of New Mexico" pp. 43-58

1971b "Junípero Serra Reports on the Missions of California" pp. 98-102

1971c "A Policy for the Colonization of California" pp. 110-115

1971d "The Strengths and Weaknesses of the California Province" pp. 116-122

1971e "Mexican Policy on Immigration to Texas" pp. 137-146

Moquin, Wayne (ed) (cont.)
1971f "Secularization of the California Missions" pp. 151-158

1971g "A Mexican Account of the Alamo" pp. 159-162

1971h "Richard Henry Dana's California" pp. 167-175

1971i "Mexican Land Claims in California" pp. 199-205

1971j "Pioneer Spanish Families in California" pp. 234-239

Morín, Paul
1966 Among the Valiant. Alhambra: Borden Publishing Co.

Mörner, Magnus
1967 Race Mixture in the History of Latin America. Boston: Little, Brown and Company

Myrdal, Gunnar
1944 An American Dilemma. New York: Harper and Brothers

Nabokov, Peter
1969 Tijerina and the Courthouse Raid. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press.

Nall, Frank C. II
1962 "Role Expectations: A Cross-Cultural Study" Rural Sociology 27 (March) : 28-41

Nall, Frank C. II and Joseph Speilberg
1967 "Social and Cultural Factors in the Responses of Mexican-Americans to Medical Treatment" Journal of Health and Social Behavior 8 (December) : 299-308

Nelson, Eugene
1966 Huelga: The First Hundred Days of the Great Delano Grape Strike. Delano: Farm Worker Press

Nogueira, Oracy
1959 "Skin Color and Social Class" pp. 165-179 in Plantation Systems of the New World. Washington, D.C.: Pan American Union

Officer, James E.
1971 "The American Indian and Federal Policy" pp. 8-65 in Jack O. Waddell and O. Michael Watson (eds) The American Indian in Urban Society. Boston: Little, Brown and Company

Olivarez, Grace
1970 We, the Mexican Americans. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census

Ortego, Phillip D.
1970 "Montezuma's Children" The Center Magazine 3 (November/December): 23-31

Othón de Mendizabal, Miguel
1968 "El Origen Histórico de Nuestra Clases Medias" pp. 2-22 in Ensayos Sobre las Clases Sociales en México. México,D.F.: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo

Paz, Octavio
1961 The Labyrinth of Solitude: Life and Thought in Mexico. New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Peck, Robert F. and Rogelio Díaz-Guerrero
1967 "Two Core-Culture Patterns and the Diffusion of Values across Their Border" International Journal of Psychology 2 (No. 4)

Peñalosa, Fernando
1967 "The Changing Mexican-American in Southern California" Sociology and Social Research 51 (July) : 405-417

1969 "Education-Income Discrepancies between Second and Later-Generation Mexican-Americans in the Southwest" Sociology and Social Research 53 (July) : 448-454

1970 "Toward an Operational Definition of the Mexican American" Aztlán 1 (Spring): 1-12

Peñalosa, Fernando and Edward C. McDonagh
1966 "Social Mobility in a Mexican-American Community" Social Forces 44 (June) : 498-505

Peterson, William
1971 Japanese Americans. New York: Random House

Pitt, Leonard
1970 The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1890. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro
1969 "Dilemmas of a Golden Exile: Integration of Cuban Refugee Families in Milwaukee" American Sociological Review 34 (August) : 505-518

Redfield, Robert
1930 Tepoztlán: A Mexican Village. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Rendón, Armando
1971 Chicano Manifesto. New York: The MacMillan Company

Renner, Kathryn N.
1969 "An Analysis of Acculturation of the Spanish Surname Population" Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, University of Texas at El Paso

Rights
1968 "A Study of Religious Discrimination by Social Clubs" Rights 4 (January) 1962 pp. 106-114 in Raymond W. Mack (ed) Race Class and Power. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold

Rivera, Julius
1972 "On the Concept of La Raza: A Preliminary Statement" Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association, San Antonio (March)

Rocco, Raymond A.
1971 "On the Limitations of an Assimilative Perspective" Social Science Quarterly 52 (June) : 35-38

Rochin, Regugio I.
1972 "The Short and Turbulent Life of Chicano Studies" Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association, San Antonio (March)

Robinson, Cecil
1963 With the Ears of Strangers: The Mexican in American Literature. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press

Rogler, C.
1946 "The Morality of Race Mixing in Puerto Rico" Social Forces 25 (October) : 77-81

Romano-V., Octavio Ignacio
1967 "Minorities, History and Cultural Mystique" El Grito: A Journal of Contemporary Mexican-American Thought 1 (Fall) : 5-11

1968 "The Anthropology and Sociology of the Mexican-Americans: The Distortion of Mexican-American History" El Grito: A Journal of Contemporary Mexican-American Thought 2 (Fall): 13-26

1969 "The Historical and Intellectual Presence of Mexican-Americans" El Grito 2 (Winter) : 32-46

Rubel, Arthur J.
1966 Across the Tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas City. Austin: Hogg Foundation, University of Texas Press

Sanchez, George I.
1940 Forgotten People. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press

Sánchez Lamego, General Miguel A.
1968 The Seige and Taking of the Alamo. Santa Fe: The Press of the Territorian

Saunders, Lyle
1954 Cultural Differences and Medical Care. New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Scott, Robin F.
1970 "The Sleepy Lagoon Case and the Grand Jury Investigation" pp. 105-116 in Manuel P. Servín (ed) The Mexican-Americans: An Awakening Minority. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1970

Sena Rivera, Jaime
1972 "The Black and Chicano Movements - 1972" Panel presentation at the Southwestern Sociological Association, San Antonio (March)

Servín, Manuel P.
1965 "The Post-World War II Mexican-American, 1925-1965: A Non-Achieving Minority" A paper presented at the Western History Association: Helena (October) reprinted pp. 144-160 in Manuel P. Servín (ed) The Mexican-Americans: An Awakening Minority. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1970

Shapiro, Harold A.
1952 "The Pecan Shellers of San Antonio, Texas" The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly 32 (March) : 229-244

Shockley, John
1972 "Crystal City: La Raza Unida and the Second Revolt" Paper given at the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association, Salt Lake City (April) to be published in a forthcoming volume by Holt, Rinehart & Winston

Simmen, Edward (ed)
1971 The Chicano: From Caricature to Self Portrait. New York: New American Library, Inc. (Mentor ed)

Simmons, Ozzie G.
1952 Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans in South Texas: A Study in Dominant-Subordinate Group Relations. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University

Simpson, Lesley Bird
1964 Many Mexicos. Berkeley: University of California Press

Slotkin, Aaron N.
1964 "The Treatment of Minorities in Textbooks" Strengthening Education 16

Smith, Joseph Jr.
1965 History of the Church Vol. II. Salt Lake City: Desert News Press

Spicer, Edward H.
1970 "Patrons of the Poor" Human Organization 29 (Spring) : 12-19

Steiner, Stan
1970 La Raza: The Mexican Americans. New York: Harper and Row

Stoddard, Ellwyn R.
1969 "The United States-Mexican Border as a Research Laboratory" Journal of Inter-American Studies 11 (July) : 477-488

1970a "Ethnic Identity of Urban Mexican-American Youth" Proceedings of the Southwest Sociological Association, Dallas (March)

Stoddard, Ellwyn R. (cont)
1970b The Role of Social Factors in the Successful Adjustment of Mexican-American Families to Forced Housing Relocation: A Final Report to the Chamizal Relocation Research Project, El Paso, Texas. El Paso: Community Renewal Program, Department of Housing and Urban Development and Department of Planning Research and Development of El Paso, Texas

1973 Mexican Americans. New York: Random House

Swadesh, Frances L.
1968 "The Alianza Movement: Catalyst for Social Change in New Mexico" Spanish-Speaking People in the United States--Proceedings of the 1968 Annual meeting of the American Ethnological Society

1969 "The Alianza Movement of New Mexico" pp. 53-84 in Henry J. Tobias and Charles E. Woodhouse (eds) Minorities and Politics. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press

1972 "The Social and Philosophical Context of Creativity in Hispanic New Mexico" The Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal 9 (January) : 11-18

Taylor, Paul S.
1931 "Crime and the Foreign Born: The Problem of the Mexican" U. S. Commission of Law Observation and Enforcement 10 : 199-243

.rado, Miguel David
1970 "Mexican American Community Political Organization" Aztlán 1 (Spring) : 53-78

Torgerson, Dial
1968 Brown Power Unity Seen Behind School Disorders" Los Angeles Times (March 17) : 1C reprinted pp. 279-288 in John H. Burma (ed) Mexican Americans in the United States: A Reader. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1970

Turner, Frederick Jackson
1920 "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" in George Rogers Taylor (ed) The Turner Thesis concerning the Role of the Frontier in American History (Rev. Ed). Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1956

U. R. G.
1971 Community Economic Analysis: El Pa Community Renewal Program. Austin: Urban Research Gr ρ, Inc. (March)

Uhlenberg, Peter
1972 "Demographic Correlates of Group Achievement: Contrasting Patterns of Mexican-Americans and Japanese-Americans" Demography 9 (February) : 119-128

Vaca, Nick
1970a "The Mexican-American in the Social Sciences, 1912-1970: Part I: 1912-1935" El Grito 3 (Summer) : 3-24

1970b "The Mexican-American in the Social Sciences, 1912-1970: Part II: 1936-1970" El Grito 4 (Fall) : 17-51

Vasconcelos, José
1926 La Raza Cósmica. Barcelona: Tipografía Cosmos

Venceremos
1971 "Las Gorras Negras: Black Beret 12 Point Program and Platform" Venceremos 1 (July 1) Albuquerque

Walter, Paul A. Jr.
1952 Race and Cultural Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill, cited in Nancie Gonzalez The Spanish-American of New Mexico: A Heritage of Pride. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Wax, Murry L.
1971 Indian Americans: Unity and Diversity. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall

Winnie, William W. Jr.
1960 "The Spanish Surname Criterion for Identifying Hispanos in the Southwestern United States: A Preliminary Evaluation" Social Forces 38 (May) : 363-366

Wolf, Eric
1960 "The Indian in Mexican Society" Alpha Kappa Deltan 30 (Winter) : 3-6

Zeleny, Carolyn
1944 Relations between the Spanish-Americans and Anglo-Americans in New Mexico: A Study of Conflict and Accomodation in a Dual-Ethnic Situation. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University